

THE
HISTORY
OF
INLAND NAVIGATIONS.

Particularly those of the
DUKE of BRIDGEWATER,
IN
LANCASHIRE and CHESHIRE;
And the intended one promoted by
Earl GOWER and other Persons of DISTINCTION
IN
STAFFORDSHIRE, CHESHIRE, and DERBYSHIRE.

PART THE SECOND.

Containing the different Essays which have been lately wrote, some to establish, others to prevent, a Navigable Canal being made from WITTON BRIDGE to KNUTSFORD, MACCLESFIELD, STOCKPORT, and MANCHESTER.

Illustrated with a whole Sheet GEOGRAPHICAL PLAN, Shewing, at one View, the Counties, Townships, and Villages through which these Navigations are or will be carried.

LONDON:

Printed for T. LOWNDES, in Fleet-street.
MDCCLXVI.

[Price Two Shillings and Six-pence.]

THE
HISTORY
OF
INLAND NAVIGATIONS.

Particularly those of the
DUKE of BRIDGOWATER,

IN
LANCASHIRE and CHESHIRE,
And the intended one promoted by

EARL GOWER and other Persons of Distinction

IN
STAFFORDSHIRE, CHESHIRE, and DERBYSHIRE.

PART THE SECOND.

Containing the different Efforts which have been lately
made, some to establish, others to prevent, a Navigable
Canal being made from WITTON BRIDGE to KNUETS-
FORD, Macclesfield, Stockport, and Manchester.
Illustrated with a whole Sheet Geographical Plan, show-
ing, at one View, the Counties, Townships, and Villages
through which these Navigations are or will be carried.

LONDON:
Printed for T. Lowndes, in Fleet-Street.
MDCCLXVI.

[Price Two Shillings and Six-pence.]

CONTENTS.

*S*CHHEME for an intended Canal Navigation from
Macclesfield to Stockport and Manchester, p. 1

*A State of Facts tending to shew the Utility of a Na-
vigation from Witton to Knutsford, and by Mac-
clesfield and Stockport to Manchester,* 6

Observations on the Macclesfield Navigation, 9

Remarks upon the Observations, 15

*Case of the Petitioners against the Bill for making a
navigable Canal from Witton Bridge, &c.* 20

*Observations on the Bill now depending in Parliament
for making a Navigable Canal from Witton
Bridge to Knutsford, &c.* 26

*Seasonable Considerations on a Navigable Canal intend-
ed to be cut from the River Trent to the River
Mersey,* 33

*Case in behalf of the Bill for making a Navigable
Cut or Canal from the Trent to the Mersey,* 67

*Facts and Reasons tending to shew that the proposed
Canal from the Trent to the Mersey ought not to
terminate at Northwich and Burton, and to prove
that this Plan hath been well digested, and hath
not wanted Public Notoriety,* 73

Sup-

C O N T E N T S.

Supplement to a Pamphlet, entitled, 'Seasonable Considerations on a Navigable Canal intended to be cut from the River Trent, at Wilden Ferry, in the County of Derby, to the River Mersey, in the County of Chester,' p. 88

Objections to Part of the proposed Canal from Wilden Ferry to the Mersey; humbly submitted by the true Friends of the Scheme "for opening a Communication between Hull and Liverpool," 98



SCHEME *for an intended CANAL NAVIGATION, from Macclesfield, to Mottram Andrew, from thence through Stockport, to Manchester, and from the same Point in Mottram, by the nearest Way (consistent with the Levels) to Northwich.*

November 14, 1765.

A Scheme for a CANAL NAVIGATION, from Macclesfield, to Mottram Andrew, and from thence through Stockport, to Manchester, and from the same Point in Mottram, by the nearest Way (consistent with the Levels) to Northwich, having for some Time past been under Consideration, an Advertisement has been lately inserted in the *Chester and Manchester Papers*, and also in the *London Evening Post*, for a Meeting to be had at the George, in Knutsford, on the 3d. Day of December next, when and where the Scheme will be produced, in order that the Gentlemen and other Land Owners, likely to be effected by such Undertaking, may know the Intention and hear the Merits of it.

And as every thing relating to this Scheme is intended to be carried on openly, the Design of this Paper, is, in some Measure, to explain (previous to such Meeting) the Nature of the Undertaking, and to shew the Advantages to the Public, and the little Probability of any individuals being Sufferers by it.

THE great utility of such a Navigation, will appear from the savings in the charge of carriage, in the following instances.

B

I. The

I. The present carriage of Groceries of all sorts, iron, Irish hides, tallow, butter, &c. from *Liverpool* to *Macclesfield*, is twenty-four shillings per ton, which (according to the calculation now made) will be reduced to eight shillings certain, and probably to six shillings per ton, and in much the same Proportion to *Stockport*; and the town of *Leek*, and the adjacent parts in *Staffordshire*, *Yorkshire*, and *Derbyshire*, will reap the same benefit.

II. The carriage of deal balk and plank, for building, from *Northwich* to *Macclesfield*, at present costs three-pence per foot, which (by the proposed navigation) will be brought to the same place for little more than one half-penny per foot; and the adjacent parts of *Derbyshire* and *Staffordshire*, will of course, have it so much cheaper in proportion; and from hence it seems evident, that the timber on the estates contiguous to the canal, and bought for the *Liverpool* market, will sell as much higher in proportion than at present.

III. Several parts through which the proposed canal will be carried, may very probably be supplied with coals, much cheaper than at present.

IV. The articles of flag, slate, and stone, from *Stiperson*, *Alderney* and *Keyrridge* (great quantities of which are now carried to *Knutsford*, *Northwich*, and parts adjacent, as well as for *Manchester* and *Stockport*, and that neighbourhood) may be carried for less than half the present price; and walling stone may be laid down at all convenient places in the course of the canal, upon very easy terms, for making and repairing the highways, or any other purposes.

V. The owners and occupiers of lands will have the convenience of conveying dung and marl in boats of their own (without paying tonnage) for improvement of their lands adjacent to the canal.

VI. The carriage of salt and cheese into many parts of the neighbouring counties of *York*, *Derby*, and *Stafford*, and also of malt and corn, brought as back carriage from thence, will be much lower than at present, and consequently the price of those commodities be reduced.

VII. The towns of *Manchester*, *Knutsford*, and *Northwich*, and parts adjacent, will be supplied with lime for manure, as well as building, at about one fifth part less than the present charge, which must tend greatly to the improvement of lands.

VIII. And it is apprehended this scheme will be a particular advantage to *Manchester* and other trading towns, as an application to parliament is intended for leave to make a navigable canal, beginning at *Whieldon Ferry* (from whence there is already a free navigation through several parts of *Derbyshire*, *Leicestershire*, *Nottinghamshire*, *Yorkshire*, and *Lincolnshire* to *Hull*) and to extend by several branches into *Warwickshire*, *Staffordshire*, and *Cheshire*; in which case, by joining that navigation, the *Manchester* manufactures, by means of the canal which this scheme proposes, may be carried by water through the counties before-mentioned, to *Hull*, and from thence to *London*.

IX. The *Sheffield* goods and earthen wares made at *Crouch*, and in that neighbourhood, and other manufactures of the counties of *York*, *Lincoln*, *Nottingham*, and *Derby*, and also lead, flax, hemp, and many other commodities, may be conveyed by means of this canal, to the port of *Liverpool*, upon much easier terms than at present.

X. The course of the intended canal ranging through those parts of the county of *Chester*, (from whence the markets of *Manchester*, *Stockport*, and *Macclesfield*, are chiefly supplied) the land owners or their tenants, within many miles of the canal,

will be enabled to convey the produce of their farms to those markets, by vessels proposed to be stationed at convenient places, to go and return at stated hours, each market day, with their corn, cheese, and other goods, and the owners of such goods may go and return in the same vessels, the expence of which carriage will be much easier than at present, it being apprehended the same will not exceed three-pence an horse load, and so in proportion for more or less on any part of the canal.

It is well known, that *Holland*, by canal navigations, has the advantage of every other nation in respect of trade, and it is apprehended, that the inland parts of this kingdom, are capable of the like advantage; and how great it must be, to this nation, will appear from one instance in particular, (amongst many others which might be given) to wit, that the carriage of iron to and from *Birmingham*, to the nearest sea-port, is at present twenty pounds to twenty-five pounds per cent.

And with respect to any damage which may happen to land owners by the proposed scheme, it is apprehended they will be very inconsiderable.

Because the canal is intended to be only five yards in breadth, and to have fords for cattle and carriages, at every convenient place, from thirty to thirty-six inches deep, (and no more) and at each ford to have a plank bridge, for foot passengers, placed upon a point, so as a man with one hand may bring it to the side, when a vessel must pass through, and when passed, with the same ease, replace it as a bridge.

By this means no fields will be so divided, but that there may be a free passage, both for foot people, cattle and carriages, from one land to another.

And

And the narrowness of the canal (which with the towing paths will be but about nine yards in breadth) reduces the quantity of land, to be purchased for the purpose, to one *Cheshire* acre and an half per mile, or thereabouts.

But whatever unavoidable damages may happen, it is intended that proper provisions of recompence shall be made to all persons who may be affected by the undertaking.

It is proposed by this scheme, that the tonnage shall be limited so as not to exceed 2 s. 6 d.—That (subject to such tonnage) the navigation shall be free to every person, and that all reasonable advantages in respect to wharfs, warehouses, &c. shall be reserved to the land owners.

A subscription will be opened at *Knutsford*, on the day fixed by the advertisement before-mentioned, when calculations of the Expence, likely to attend the undertaking, and also the profits which may arise from the tonnage, will be produced and any gentleman disposed to encourage the undertaking, will be at liberty to subscribe any Sum not less than 500 l.

N. B. some gentlemen of fortune have proposed to apply to parliament, at their own expence, for an act to carry this scheme into execution, and are willing to be large subscribers themselves to the undertaking: and this invitation to a subscription, is not from any doubt, but that it will soon be filled up, several other persons having already proposed to subscribe considerable sums.

A STATE OF FACTS, *tending to shew the Utility of the proposed CANAL NAVIGATION from Witton near Northwich to Knutsford and Macclesfield, and by Stockport to Manchester.*

THE rivers *Weaver* and *Mersey* (the latter of which falls into the western seas) were by nature navigable from *Liverpool* to *Frodsham* bridge, in the county of *Chester*.

By an act of parliament that passed (7th *George* I.) certain trustees were impowered to make the *Weaver* navigable from *Frodsham* Bridge to *Winsford* Bridge, in the same County. And by the same Act, they were also impowered to extend such navigation, by making *Witton Brooke* navigable, from its junction with the *Weaver* up to *Witton* Bridge. These navigations have been long since perfected, and trade and commerce thereby extended, to the great benefit of the public.

The north eastern parts of the county of *Chester* lie remotest from those or any other navigations, although, from the circumstances of their situation and produce, the number and employment of their inhabitants, they want them most.

The canal navigation, now proposed, is designed to be carried from the navigable part of *Witton Brooke* at *Witton* Bridge, near *Northwich*, to the market towns of *Knutsford*, *Macclesfield*, and by *Stockport* to *Manchester*.

This navigation will, in common with others, have all the general advantages of navigation.

And the peculiar utility of this plan will appear from the particulars following:

The greatest part of the county, through which the canal is intended to pass, is very populous, and several valuable manufactures are carried on there,
by

by which many thousands of industrious poor subsist.—It is apprehended this circumstance alone will greatly recommend a scheme, which by cheapening carriage, tends directly to reduce the price of provisions, and consequentially the price of labour.

Many articles of these manufactures, and other goods and merchandize from those parts, may, by this canal, be conveyed to the port of *Liverpool*, and to and from one market-town to another, and the interior parts of the country, for one half, and others for one third less than the price of the present carriage.

There is a great land-carriage of salt, cheese, oatmeal, and other commodities, from distant parts to *Macclesfield*, *Stockport* and *Manchester*, which are chiefly consumed in *Yorkshire* and *Derbyshire*, bordering on this part of the county of *Chester*; in return for which, wheat, malt, flour, and other commodities of those counties, are brought back for consumption in *Lancashire* and *Cheshire*; there will be a saving in the carriage of these commodities, by the proposed canal, from one-half to three-fourths.

Upon the confines of *Chester*, near to *Buxton* in the county of *Derby*, there is an inexhaustible fund of limestone, from whence the greatest part of *Cheshire*, the town of *Manchester*, and the adjacent country, is supplied by land carriage.

By the proposed canal, all the interior parts of the county of *Chester*, and many parts of *Lancashire*, may be supplied with lime for building and manure, at one-fifth part less than the present price.

In the hills about *Macclesfield*, and other parts near the course of the canal proposed, are great quantities of flag, slate and stone, which may be conveyed to distant parts, where great quantities

are used, for less than half the present prices; and stones for fence walls, and repairs of the highways, laid down at all convenient places in the course of the canal, upon very easy terms.

As this canal will pass through that part of *Cheshire*, from whence the markets of *Manchester*, *Stockport*, *Macclesfield* and *Knutsford* are supplied, the produce of farms may be conveyed to these several towns, by vessels stationed at the most convenient places, and which may go and return at fixed hours, whereby the markets will be supplied with more ease and certainty, as well as cheapness.

But, besides the advantages already enumerated, another still remains to be mentioned. In that part of the county above referred to, and particularly at *Macclesfield*, (where many and large manufactures are carried on) there was formerly great plenty of coal (which probably was the main reason of their being originally established in that situation) but the coal mines are now nearly exhausted, insomuch, that the present price of coals there is one-third at least higher than it was ten years ago. And unless some expedient is contrived to reduce the price, the manufacturers must, in a short space of time, either remove or be ruined; the canal proposed, will pass near other coal mines, some of which are already in working, and others may be opened, which will relieve the manufacturers from the present scarcity, and prevent the decay and destruction of trade, so important to the public.

As this scheme is so extensively useful, so it has been judged easily practicable upon accurate surveys. It has been generally and almost universally approved at three several county meetings, held in consequence of public advertisements for that purpose. It is not calculated upon any other principles, but to be carried on by an open public subscription, in
which

which many persons of distinguished rank and fortune in the county bear their part. The tonnage to be taken, is calculated at the most moderate rates, and is proposed to be divided and paid only in proportion to certain distances and stages, from and to which the goods shall be conveyed: And it may be proper to be observed, that upon the most reasonable computation of tonnage at the rates proposed, compared with the present charges of land-carriage, the savings to the public are estimated at no less than 7000*l. per Annum*; and by means of the proposed canal, may probably hereafter amount to double that sum; and that the greater part of the articles on which these savings are computed, come usually from *Macclesfield*, a place, as was before observed, the farthest removed from any Navigation.

The promoters of this scheme can support the facts alledged, by clear evidence.

A design so plainly calculated to serve both the landed and trading interests, and which may co-operate with and greatly assist other plans and designs of the same nature, but can obstruct none, will, it is humbly hoped, deserve the attention and favour of the legislature.

OBSERVATIONS *on the intended Navigation from Witton-Bridge to Knutsford; and from thence through Macclesfield and Stockport, to the Town of Manchester.*

THE general utility of inland navigations has been long experienced in foreign countries, and the peculiar advantages which attend them in a kingdom like ours, which derives its welfare and security from the improvement of trade and commerce, has been so clearly demonstrated by some late experiments, that

that the prejudices too usually entertained against all new attempts, seem to be entirely removed; as may be concluded from the many applications now before parliament, for leave to make Navigable Canals.

The practicability of making such canals in the most unfavourable situations, and the preference they claim over river navigations, has been sufficiently proved by the cut which was begun, and is now carrying on, at the sole expence of the Duke of *Bridgwater*; whom the legislature have, from time to time, invested with powers to make a navigable canal from *Worsley* to *Manchester*; from thence by *Stretford*, *Altrincham*, *Dunham*, &c. to the river *Mersey*, at or near the *Hempstones*, under very particular limitations: his Grace being restrained from selling coals at *Manchester*, for more than four-pence per hundred, which were generally sold for six-pence or more, and to the poor in small quantities, at a much higher price, and were likely to be advanced; and also from taking more than six shillings per ton (freight and tonnage included) for conveying goods from *Manchester* to *Liverpool*, which were then conveyed by water at twelve shillings; and, from the difficulties attending the old navigation, were frequently conveyed by land carriage between those towns, at the expence of forty shillings per ton. His Grace has already made great progress in this work, which he has continued about fifteen miles in length, and proposes carrying it on, without a single lock, to the place where it is intended to join the navigation between the *Trent* and the *Mersey*; being about twelve miles farther.

But in order to free the navigation from the great delays occasioned by locks, he has been obliged, at an immense expence, to convey it in some places over large rivers and low grounds; and in others,
to

to make deep cuts, where the surface of the land has been above the level.

It is obvious, that very great risque must have attended the progress of such an expensive undertaking, which was to be carried into execution by means of expedients, which, being many of them untried, their success was consequently uncertain. But they were so skilfully and happily conducted, as to answer, and indeed to exceed, all the expectations entertained in favour of the navigation; which has proved of very extraordinary advantage to the town of *Manchester* and the adjacent parts; his Grace supplying that place with coals at three-pence halfpenny per hundred (being less than the price limited by the legislature) and likewise furnishing the poor with coals in the smallest quantities, at the same reduced price, being about one third part of what they used to pay.

The unexpected success which attended the progress of this great work, occasioned an application to the Duke about two years since, from *Macclesfield*, desiring a branch to be extended thither from his canal; but as his navigation was not then carried into *Cheshire*, and as he had still very considerable difficulties to surmount, in taking it over the river *Mersey*, and the low grounds for a great extent on each side that river, the success of which was at that time hazardous, his Grace did not then think himself in a situation to enter into farther engagements; but professed a readiness to promote such a design, when his canal should be so far advanced, which now it is, as to admit of such a communication.

The town of *Stockport* was likewise desirous of having a branch extended thither; and petitions to parliament were prepared, with a view to have been presented for that purpose, the last sessions; but the intended

intended application being accidentally prevented at that time, it has, at the earnest request of the town in general, been revived this session; and a Bill is now before parliament, to enable his Grace to make the same, without the consideration of any additional tonnage.

But notwithstanding the many advantages which have been derived from the Duke's navigation, and are still farther to be expected from its extension, a new one has been projected, which is to terminate at both ends near the Duke's, and to pass through the towns of *Macclesfield* and *Stockport*, and in many parts near to the course of his Grace's canal; whereby, as will be shewn, those towns in particular, and the public in general, would be deprived of many advantages which might be better attained by the extension of the Duke's canal, than by means of the navigation which is newly projected.

A bill, nevertheless, is now depending in parliament, for carrying this new scheme into execution, and a paper has been handed about, called *A State of Facts*, the contents of which paper are evidently founded on misinformation, or misapprehension. This intended navigation is so far from being, as therein stated, easily practicable, and generally beneficial; that the execution of it will be attended with extraordinary difficulties, and the use of it be interrupted by the most prejudicial delays, as will evidently appear to every intelligent and impartial observer, from the following comparative view of the respective merits of the two navigations in question:

The

The whole length of land to be cut, upon the plan from *Northwich* to *Macclesfield*, *Stockport* and *Manchester*, is — 37 Miles.

The whole length of land to be cut, from the Duke's proposed canal between *Sale Moor* and *Stockport*, if a branch was to be taken, from a place near *Cheadle* to *Macclesfield*, is — 12 Miles.

Difference — 25 Miles.

The lockage from *Macclesfield* to *Northwich* by *Motram*, and from *Motram* to *Stockport* :

	Feet.	Inches.	Feet.	Inch.
From <i>Macclesfield</i> to <i>Motram</i> —	138	7		
From <i>Motram</i> to <i>Northwich</i> —	235	9		
			374	4
From <i>Motram</i> to <i>Stockport</i> , at 25 feet above the surface of the water in the river —			138	3
From thence to <i>Manchester</i> it is proposed to be upon a dead level —				
Total lockage upon the <i>Macclesfield</i> plan	512	7		
The lockage from the Duke's proposed canal, from a place near <i>Cheadle</i> to <i>Macclesfield</i> —			276	10
Difference	235	9		

From the preceding comparison, it appears that by the cut intended from the Duke's canal to *Macclesfield*, there will be a saving in the purchasing and cutting of land, and in making roads, towing paths, &c. of 25 miles ; besides the consequential saving in bridges,

bridges, &c. and that there will likewise be a farther saving, in lockage only, of 235 feet and 9 inches.

By reason of this great difference, the communication from the Duke's canal, may be made in less time, and at less expence; and, when made, the conveyance of goods between *Manchester, Stockport, Macclesfield, and Liverpool*, will consequently be much more cheap, convenient, and expeditious, than by the proposed navigation from *Witton-Bridge*.

In short, every public advantage to be expected from a navigation will be more certainly and easily procured by branches from the Duke's canal to *Macclesfield* and *Stockport*, than by the circuitry of the plan newly projected: and with regard to that part of *Cheshire*, which lies east of *Preston on the Hill, Northwich, and Middlewich*, it will in every respect be well accommodated by the communication of the Duke's canal, with the intended navigation between the *Trent* and the *Mersey*, at *Preston Brook*, as they will be continued from thence to *Worsley, Manchester, Altrincham*, and as far as *Middlewich*, without a lock.

Since therefore no local or general advantage can attend the proposed navigation from *Witton Bridge*, through *Macclesfield* and *Stockport*, to *Manchester*, but what may be attained in a superior degree, by means of branches extended to those places from the Duke's canal; it is humbly presumed, that such a mistaken application will not engage the favour of the legislature.

REMARKS

REMARKS upon the Observations on the intended Navigation from Witton-Bridge to the Towns of Knutsford, Macclesfield, Stockport, and Manchester.

“ UPON comparing the Observations with the paper they were designed to answer, it is obvious to remark, that the writer has not contested so much as one of the particular allegations in it; but has left the authors of the scheme in possession of all those facts that so clearly prove the utility of their plan.

Instead of any remarks of this sort, the writer very early discovers a partiality to his Grace the Duke of *Bridgewater's* canal, and a desire, not only to extend the same for the benefit of his collieries, but also to prevent a communication between the navigation of the *Weaver* and the towns of *Knutsford*, *Macclesfield*, *Stockport*, and *Manchester*; and these are in truth the grounds of the whole opposition to the canal proposed.

He admits his Grace was applied to two years ago, to extend his canal to *Macclesfield*, which he rejected; nor is it probable his Grace would have bestowed a thought upon that scheme, if he had not found himself interested, upon this occasion, to exclude the owners of other collieries from the benefit of water carriage, and to prevent a communication with the *Weaver*, in order to secure to himself a more extensive and lucrative monopoly.

However, this writer is very confident that all the advantages of the navigation proposed, may be attained in a superior degree by branches extended from the Duke's canal; which communication may, according to him, be made in less time, and at less expence; and, in order to prove this, he argues thus,

“ The

“ The land to be cut upon the plan from
Northwich to Macclesfield, Stockport,
and Manchester, is ————— 37 Miles.

“ The land to be cut from *Cheadle to*
Macclesfield is ————— 12 Miles.

—————
 Difference 25 Miles.”

But, *first*, how has it happened that the land from *Northwich to Macclesfield, Stockport and Manchester*, is taken, in the former part of the comparison, to make so large a number as 37 miles; and the land from the *Hempstones to Cheadle, &c.* omitted, in the latter part, in order to leave so small a number as 12 miles? Or, how is the extent of benefit equal, when so large a tract of country is left out of the account?

Secondly, His Grace has no bill for this purpose now depending: the writer forgets how much work of this sort his Grace has upon his hands already: that great part of the navigation to the *Hempstones* remains still to be completed: that the cut to *Stockport* is not yet begun; and, when these are added to the 12 miles from *Cheadle to Macclesfield*, how much will it fall short of the 37 miles? Besides, as the object of the proposed navigation is a communication with the *Weaver* at *Northwich*, the Length from the Duke's canal to *Northwich* ought to have been brought into the comparison.

The argument, with respect to lockage, may receive the same kind of answer: the writer ought to have brought into that comparison the lockage down to the *Hempstones*, for the lockage from *Macclesfield* to the *Tideway* will be the same, let the course of the canal vary as it may.

The circuitry of the navigation proposed, which this writer condemns, is the very circumstance that
 gives

gives it the advantage over the cut he proposes: the necessity of taking such a compass arises from the situation and produce of the lands through which the canal is to pass: the present state of their trade and manufactures; their connection with other countries, and those other circumstances which it is needless here to repeat, as they are stated in the former paper, to which no answer has been attempted.

A branch from the Duke's canal, to be made from *Cheadle* to *Macclesfield*, will not answer the purposes proposed by the navigation from *Witton-Bridge* to *Knutsford*, *Macclesfield*, *Stockport*, and *Manchester*; but the design of making such branch appears plainly to be, to prevent a communication between the navigation of the *Weaver* and those towns, and between one town and another; and also, to prevent the owners of the collieries in *Norbury*, and that neighbourhood, from supplying the Towns of *Stockport*, *Macclesfield* and *Knutsford*, and the adjacent countries, with coals, in order that the Duke may supply them with his own coals, and at his own price; the restraint on him, as to the price of his coals, being confined to *Manchester*.

This navigation is not intended to prevent or obstruct either the Duke's canal from *Sale Moor* to *Stockport*, which it is to cross there, or that from the *Trent* to the *Mersey*, which it is to cross about a mile from *Witton-Bridge*; but instead of giving any obstruction to either of them, the promoters of this navigation, who are owners of the greatest part of the lands through which it is to be made, are willing to cross the other canals upon a level so as to make a communication with each of them; or to carry this navigation either over or under the others, if the level of the ground, where the crossing shall happen, will admit of it.

Upon the whole, the following queries are proposed to the consideration of the writer of the Observations, and also of the public.

First, Whether it is reasonable that the Duke should be impowered to extend his canal wherever he thinks proper, through the lands of the gentlemen in *Cheshire*, in order to bring his coals to a better market; and that the *Cheshire* gentlemen, who have collieries there, should be denied the liberty of making a canal to accommodate their neighbours with their own coals, though, by reason of the shortness of the carriage, they may afford to sell their coals at a cheaper rate than the Duke can afford to sell his?

Secondly, Whether the fire-engine, which has been set up at the colliery in *Norbury*, to accommodate the country with coals, is not attended with great expence, and must not continue to be so, let the sale be greater or less; and whether the *Norbury* coals are not now sold at *Stockport*, though brought thither by land carriage, as cheap as the Duke now sells his at *Altrincham* or *Manchester*; and whether the owners of the collieries in *Norbury*, and that neighbourhood, may not afford to reduce the price of coals at *Stockport*, when brought thither by the proposed canal; and whether they may not, by means of the canal, afford to supply the country adjacent thereto, much cheaper than the Duke can?

Thirdly, Whether the Duke's reducing the price of coals at *Manchester* from four-pence to three-pence halfpenny *per hundred*, as mentioned in the Observations, was of choice, or through necessity, by reason of other coals being brought thither by land-carriage, and with which a great part of that town is now supplied?

Fourthly, Whether the extending the navigation from *Witton-Bridge* to *Knutsford*, *Macclesfield*, *Stockport*,

port, and *Manchester*, will not be more for the good of the public, and supply those towns, and the adjacent country, with all necessaries for the support of their markets and manufactures; and also with coals, lime, slate, flag-stone, &c. better than a branch from the Duke's canal between *Cheadle* and *Macclesfield*?

Fifthly, Whether, in all cases, it is not better for any town or country to have two supplies than one, and particularly to encourage that supply that will come the cheapest?

Sixthly, Whether the proposed canal from *Witton-Bridge* (subject to a tonnage, payable in proportions, according to certain fixed stages) is not more reasonable than that of the Duke's, on which the whole tonnage is payable if a vessel comes upon any part of it; and whether, for this reason, the Duke is not now, and likely to continue, the sole carrier upon his canal; and whether, for the same reason, he will not be the sole carrier upon all branches from it?

Seventhly, Whether, by extending branches from the Duke's canal, in the manner proposed in the Observations, it may not happen hereafter, that the agents of his Grace (abusing his confidence, and without his knowledge and privity) may not, by degrees, monopolize great part of the corn, flour, meal, and other necessaries, for the supply of the towns of *Manchester* and *Stockport*, and dispose of them, or suffer them to be disposed of, at his own warehouses, without being brought into the markets, and make his Grace's exclusive privilege of water-carriage the instrument of the most oppressive exactions?

Eighthly, Whether it is not for the publick good to prevent monopolies, to promote and keep up publick markets, and to open as many communi-

cations for the supply of market-towns, and manufacturing countries, and to employ as many different carriers as may be?

Ninthly, Whether, as the Duke has not been opposed in the bill for extending his canal to *Stockport*, it is reasonable that he should oppose the making of the proposed canal from *Witton-Bridge* to *Knutsford*, *Macclesfield*, *Stockport*, and *Manchester*.

CASE of the PETITIONERS against the BILL for making A NAVIGABLE CANAL from WITTON BRIDGE to several Places therein named.

THE general advantages attending inland navigations have been fully experienced, and are universally allowed. Nevertheless, as in particular situations, and under particular circumstances, they may be more prejudicial than useful, the legislature will expect the most satisfactory evidence, that every proposal of this nature will have a tendency to benefit the public, before they will invest the undertakers with those powers over private property, which must necessarily be granted, for carrying such proposal into execution.

Public utility therefore being the only consideration which can induce the legislature to countenance such undertakings, it is by this test that the merits of the proposed navigation from *Witton Bridge* to the several places mentioned in the bill, must be determined: And if it shall appear, that the execution of the projected scheme, so far from being useful, will be injurious to the public; that it will be attended with no general benefit, adequate in any degree to the injury which will be done, by cutting through lands against the consent of the owners, and

diverting of water from mills, in which not only the proprietors, but the public in general are interested.—If it shall appear likewise, that so far as it may, at the expence of such injury and devastation, be rendered of partial use; that every such purpose may be better answered by means of other navigations already authorized to be made, and the progress of which it will prevent or impede; then a proposal, so highly injurious, will be rejected without hesitation.

It is alledged in the preamble of the bill, that the extending the navigation of the port of *Liverpool*, to the trading towns of *Knutsford*, *Macclesfield* and *Stockport*; and from thence to *Manchester* and the adjacent country, will tend to the benefit of trade and commerce, and be of great public utility. But in order to shew on what mistaken or fallacious grounds these allegations are founded, it will be material to observe, that with respect to *Knutsford*, it is very improperly classed among the trading towns; for the trade there carried on is too inconsiderable to afford exportation of any great profit or convenience from the freight of goods between that town and *Liverpool*.

As to *Macclesfield*, to which the course of the proposed canal is in the next place to be shaped, it is admitted to be a place of considerable trade: but this trade consists chiefly in the manufacture of silk and of mohair buttons; and it cannot be even pretended that any part, either of the raw materials for these manufactures, or of the goods when manufactured, will be conveyed by means of the intended canal: For the weight is so inconsiderable in proportion to the value, that they will be sent, as now, by land-carriage: and as to the conveyance of copper and copper ore, with some other articles of commerce, it cannot be supposed that they will coun-

tervail the expence of making a canal, which at a fair estimation will amount to near 80,000 *l.* especially as a communication might, if thought necessary, be opened between those towns, by another more expeditious, cheap, and convenient passage.

The next town to which the course of the proposed canal is to extend, is *Stockport*; and, with respect to this town, it may be affirmed, that was the proposed navigation to be even free from tonnage, no goods would be conveyed upon it between that town and *Liverpool*; as the conveyance thereby would not only be several miles farther, than by the duke's canal; but the former would likewise have many more feet of lockage upon it, beside the inconvenience of being obliged to pass thro' the *Northwich* navigation, which is liable to various obstructions from the neap or low tides, as well as from floods; not to insist on the delay and damage which must ensue from the necessity of transshipping goods.

From *Stockport*, the intended navigation is to terminate at *Manchester*: and the same reasons which prove it useless to the former, evince much stronger the inutility of it to the latter; for, on comparing the duke's canal with the intended navigation, in respect to the conveyance between *Manchester* and *Liverpool*; the distance, the difference of lockage, and the obstructions of the *Northwich* navigation, all concur to establish the preference in favour of the duke's; and to shew the inexpedience of that proposed by the bill in question: which, should it be carried into execution, to the full extent of the powers therein given, might prove the means of depriving the public of many advantages they now receive, and may farther expect, from the duke of *Bridgewater's* canal: for the undertakers of the new navigation, being not only impowered to take any brooks, streams, or watercourses, within 500 yards, but

but also, with the consent of the commissioners, within 1000 yards of the intended canal; and, with the consent of the land-owners, to make any locks, sluices, or other conveniencies, without restriction or limitation, for carrying goods to or from the said canal; it may, without any unreasonable jealousy, be apprehended that they mean to withdraw the water which now supplies the duke's navigation, to the ruin of the works already constructed, and the prevention of any farther progress.

A power of this extent, must alarm every one who is sensible of the public benefits which have been derived from his grace's canal, and may yet be expected from its extension: not to insist on the private injury which the duke will thereby sustain, and which will not be compensated by promoting any purpose whatever of public utility.

Nevertheless, some plausible objections have been furnished to depreciate the duke's navigation, and beget a prepossession in favour of the new one.

OBJECTION I.

It is pretended that the acts under which the duke carries on his navigation, are so framed, that they secure to him a monopoly: and that no one can carry goods upon his canal, without being liable to the whole tonnage of 2*s.* 6*d.* *per* ton, although they do not go above 100 yards upon it.

ANSWER.

To this it may be answered, that when his grace obtained the acts in question, there were but three navigations in that part of the kingdom; in which the tonnage was in the same manner to be taken for the whole distance, or any part of it: and, in fact, 3*s.* 4*d.* *per* ton is now taken on the *Irwell* and *Mersey*; whereas the duke is confined to 2*s.* 6*d.* though his canal is of greater extent, and upon a

new and more expensive plan of execution, and is, to all intents and purposes, a *free* navigation: the 2 s. 6 d. likewise includes tonnage and wharfage. And his grace, and all persons navigating upon his canal, are restrained from taking more than 6 s. *per* ton, (freight, tonnage, and wharfage included) for conveying of Goods between *Manchester* and *Liverpool*; which were then conveyed by water at 12 s. and from the difficulties attending the old navigation, were frequently conveyed by land-carriage between those towns, at the expence of 40 s. *per* ton. His grace likewise was restrained from taking more than 4 d. *per* hundred for coals at *Manchester* and *Salford*, which were generally sold for 6 d. or more; and to the poor in small quantities at a much higher price, which was then also likely to be advanced. No such limitations or restrictions appear in any of the acts for the other navigations, nor in the bill for the canal from *Witton-Bridge*, now under consideration.

OBJECTION II.

It is urged likewise, that the more navigations are encouraged, the better it will be for the public, who will be gainers by them if they succeed; whereas, if they miscarry, the undertakers will be the only losers.

ANSWER.

But it is obvious, that all supplies should be adapted to the extent of the demand there is for them; and however it may be pretended that the undertakers of ill-advised enterprizes will be the only losers by their miscarriage, yet it is evident that they cannot suffer alone. For if their plan fails in the execution, it will not only be attended with a great waste of private property, but a considerable quantity of lands must long lie totally useless, and be lost to the common stock. With re-
spect

spect to the case in question, however, the mischief will be more immediate and certain, since the new navigation cannot succeed in any degree, without destroying or injuring one more beneficial to the publick.

OBJECTION III.

It has been insinuated likewise, that it would be unreasonable to restrain the gentlemen of the county of *Chester*, from making a navigation through their own estates.

ANSWER.

To which it may be replied, that this is so far from being founded on fact, that they have not been able to obtain consent from the proprietors of lands to the extent of many miles; beside, no one should be allowed to use even his own property to the injury of individuals, much less of the publick: and it is apparent, that if the intended navigation should be carried into execution, not only the property of several land-owners, who petition against the bill, will be mutilated against their consent, but manifest injury will be done to the proprietors of several mills, by diverting their water, not only to their prejudice, but to the great detriment of the public, who are interested therein, and for which no suitable recompence can be made.

Under these circumstances therefore, when it is considered, that the ostensible plea of public utility, by which it is attempted to support this bill, and which is the only just principle on which all undertakings of this nature can be countenanced—when this plea is evidently groundless and fallacious; when it is seen, that several inhabitants of those very towns, who it is pretended will receive benefit from the scheme, as well as several land-owners and proprietors of mills, have petitioned against it, as being likely to prove, not only useless, but injurious

to

to themselves and to the public; when it appears likewise, that the execution of this plan would intercept the supplies of water, which have been granted to his Grace, and brought to his canal at an immense expence, and thereby prevent the completion of the navigation the Duke is authorized to make, and deprive the publick of the advantages they would reap from the progress and perfecting of so useful an undertaking.—It is presumed, that the legislature will not give the sanction of their authority to an attempt, which in fact is calculated to elude their own acts, by frustrating and preventing the execution of powers, which they themselves have granted, after the most solemn deliberation; especially as those powers, so far as they have been executed, have proved of acknowledged publick benefit; and the plan set in competition with it, does not bear even a probability of any such tendency, but on the contrary, will be attended with immediate and certain injury, both to individuals and to the Publick.

CONSIDERATIONS *on the* **BILL**
now depending in Parliament, for making a **N A-**
VIGABLE CANAL *from* **Witton-**
Bridge to Knutsford, Macclesfield, Stockport and
Manchester.

T H E great object of this bill is, to obtain the benefit of water-carriage for the north-eastern parts of *Cheshire*, which at present lie remote from any navigation whatever. The bill hath already passed the House of Commons, and seems to merit the approbation of the other branches of the legislature, both from the situation and circumstances of those who promote, and those who oppose it.

The

The promoters of this plan (exclusive of a great body of traders and merchants) are a considerable number of persons of the highest rank and property in the counties through which the canal will pass. Can it be supposed these gentlemen do not understand the exigencies and wants of the neighbourhood in which they live? Or that they are not competent judges of the probity and skill of those persons whom they have employed to make their surveys and estimates? Or that they would risque their fortunes (as they have done by subscriptions) upon the merits of this scheme, if they were not convinced it was both practicable and useful? This concurrence of circumstances deserves therefore to have great stress laid upon it; because it is the strongest testimony of the best witnesses.

If the sentiments of the owners, through whose lands the canal is to be cut, ought to have any weight (as surely they are of the greatest) it may be observed, that of 37 miles of land, the length of the cut proposed, the owners of 24 miles are strongly for the bill; and the greater part of the others do not oppose it; so striking a disproportion is always attended to, in cases of this sort, where absolute unanimity is never to be expected.

On the other hand, those who have hitherto appeared to oppose this Bill, are far inferior in number and property; and their opposition is plainly grounded on partial and local objections: Two gentlemen will receive prejudice in their mills: This it is granted would be an objection, if the usual provisions of recompence had not been made in the Bill; the rest are chiefly traders, who by their situation, and the nature of their dealings, have at present an opportunity of serving the publick with goods at an advanced price, one of the great mischiefs which this canal is designed to remedy.

But

But the true motives of this opposition, will be found in the private interest of his Grace the duke of *Bridgwater*; on whose behalf (though not in his name) several objections have been made, which will hereafter be particularly mentioned. For if the communication of the proposed canal with the river *Weaver* be prevented, and the collieries in *Norbury* and other parts in that neighbourhood excluded from the benefit of water-carriage, and there is no other navigation for the conveyance of corn, meal, and other provisions from *Cheshire* to *Manchester* market but the duke's canal, the design of his Grace's friends will be answered, and the monopoly they have in view secured.

In support of this opposition the following objections have been made.

OBJECTION I.

The scheme of this Bill is not practicable.

Answer. Those who make the objection do not much rely upon it: If they did, they would not say so much of the inutility of the scheme, and of its interfering with his Grace's navigation. If it be impracticable, nothing more need be said about it.

OBJECTION II.

The tonnage upon this canal will not be adequate to the expence of making it.

Answer. Calculations have been made of the expence and probable tonnage by persons well qualified to make those estimates; and the intended proprietors are so fully convinced it will be adequate, that they have proposed a less tonnage by about one-third than the duke of *Bridgwater* upon his canal; and as no publick money is asked, but the whole charge is to be defrayed out of a private fund, it may be well suspected, that so much solicitude is expressed, such vehemence of opposition exerted, not

to prevent the ruin of the undertaking, but the consequence of its success.

OBJECTION III.

The number of locks on this canal must necessarily be so great as to impede the navigation; besides the river *Weaver* with which this canal is to communicate, is an uncertain navigation, the locks often out of repair, and vessels are often neaped at the place where the *Weaver* falls into the *Mersey*.

Answer. The lockage from any given point to the tide-way will be the same which way soever the course of a canal may be; for instance, from *Macclesfield* by *Cheadle* and the Duke's canal to the tide-way, would have as many locks, as from *Macclesfield* by *Northwich* to the tide-way. As to the delay by locks, a vessel may pass a lock in about eight minutes. It is calculated, that from *Macclesfield* to *Northwich*, near 20 miles (in which part the greatest number of locks will be) a vessel may be navigated in about 12 hours. The river *Weaver* is as free from neaps as the *Mersey* at *Runcorn Gap*, the sand banks which chiefly occasion them lying below the junction of the *Weaver* with the *Mersey*, which is considerably below *Runcorn Gap*. The locks on the *Weaver* may be altered at an expence too inconsiderable to need mentioning: and the attempt of his Grace's agents to discredit all river navigations (as they constantly do) must be thought by all impartial persons wild and extravagant.

OBJECTION IV.

The utility of the scheme proposed will not be adequate to the damage it will occasion, not only to private property, but to the public, by the destruction of several mills.

Answer. As to any injury to private property, recompence is provided: There are not above two mills upon the course of the canal that will be materially

terially injured ; and there are other mills in the same neighbourhood. Are these considerations to be put in the balance with an annual saving of 7000*l.* and upwards to the public, between the difference of land and water-carriage ?

The particular articles with which that part of the country may be served by this, and can be served by no other navigation, have been mentioned in other papers, and will, if necessary, be proved hereafter : But the utility that will arise to the public from water-carriage for coals, is too important to be passed over without particular mention.

The town of *Macclesfield*, where some thousands of poor are employed, is in imminent danger of losing its manufactures for the want of that commodity ; what coal mines they had near them, being some intirely, others nearly exhausted. The collieries at *Norbury*, *Pointon* and *Worth*, lie near to the course of the canal proposed between *Stockport* and *Macclesfield*. *Norbury* alone, it is computed, will furnish at least 10,000 tons of coals every year, which may be sold at *Macclesfield*, and also at *Knutsford* and the parts adjacent, at 4*d.* for an hundred weight, for which, at the places last mentioned, at present 7*d.* is paid. Is this no advantage to the public ? It was thought so great an one in the Duke of *Bridgwater's* case, that his Grace obtained his first Act of Parliament upon no other ground, than the benefit that would accrue to the town of *Manchester*, from the cheap supply of coals from his Grace's collieries at *Worsley*.

OBJECTION V.

A cut from his Grace's canal from *Cheadle* to *Macclesfield*, would serve all the purposes proposed by this scheme.

Answer.

Answer. It most clearly would not. It ranges though a different part of the country. The whole extent from *Macclesfield* to *Knutsford* and *Northwich* is left unprovided. Can his Grace afford his coals at *Macclesfield*, as cheap as they could be sold there from *Norbury* and other collieries? And if he could (which from the length of carriage is not to be presumed) what provision would there be for *Knutsford*, and the other places upon the course of the canal proposed? Not to mention that his Grace is not obliged, by any thing that yet has passed, to make this cut; nor could he make it for many years, amidst the multiplicity of those works which he already has upon his hands.

OBJECTION VI.

The proprietors, if this bill passes into a law, will be enabled, under the powers therein given, greatly to prejudice the Duke of *Bridgwater's* navigation, by taking into the proposed canal the waters of several brooks or streams which fall into his Grace's canal.

Answer. The only streams that it is presumed are meant in this objection are three brooks, called *Houghs-end Brook*, *Corn Brook*, and the *Medlock*, all which it is admitted the proposed canal will cross upon high arches, to be made over the same; but the crossing of the *Medlock*, which is near the termination of this canal at *Manchester*, will be above a mile distant from his Grace's canal, and the crossing the other brooks will be at much greater distances; and at all the places where the crossings are to be, the level of the proposed canal will be so much higher than the three several brooks, that the water cannot be taken out of the same into the proposed canal, by any of the powers granted to the proprietors, by the bill; and of this his Grace's agents and friends (who attended the bill through
the

the committee of the House of Commons) were so well satisfied, that, although they presented a clause to restrain the proprietors from taking any water out of two other brooks, they took no notice of the three brooks above-mentioned.

As the termination of the proposed canal at Manchester is fixed to a certain place, the level of the canal must be governed by the height of the ground there, and it is well known that the proposed canal between *Stockport* and *Manchester* will be upon a dead level, and will be supplied with water from the *Cheshire* part of the canal, which must be let into it every time a lock is opened, and cannot be returned into *Cheshire*, but must be discharged towards *Manchester*; so that the proposed canal may afford a supply to his Grace's canal, but cannot take any water out of the streams which flow into it.

It is not to be presumed that his Grace's agents and friends (who attended the committee of the House of Commons, and to whom it must have appeared, upon the face of the bill, that the proposed canal was to cross those three brooks) at that time apprehended, that water could be taken out of the same into the proposed canal; for if so, they would no doubt have then made the objection, that provisions might have been made in the bill to prevent the taking out such water; but if, from any information since received, they are now doubtful of it, the proprietors are willing that the bill may be amended, so as to restrain them from taking water out of any of these brooks, or any other brooks that shall appear essentially necessary for the supply of his Grace's canal.

OBJECTION VII.

It is unreasonable, considering the expence his Grace has been at, and the merit of his undertaking, that any other navigation should be made

to communicate with the places to which his canal extends, so as to deprive him of any advantages which he may expect from his navigation.

Answer. This reasoning directly tends to justify monopolies and exclusive rights, whereas his Grace hath not even the merit of being an original inventor; for the *Sankey* navigation in the same country, is a canal, and was made before his Grace's canal was thought of: And further, this argument, if pursued into its consequences, would prove that his Grace, by making his canal, has been a greater enemy to one part of the country, than he has been a friend to the other.

Public service, as it is the avowed motive and end, so it ought to be the test of all these undertakings. Wherever that is pointed out, the legislature will concur in carrying the scheme into execution. But his Grace's friends ought of all men to be the last in advancing arguments of this sort; which he himself exploded in the case of the proprietors of the *Irwell* navigation. The reasoning on which this opposition is founded, is directly repugnant to the principles which his Grace four years ago asserted, as well as to every principle which hath hitherto been allowed to prevail in a nation of trade and liberty.

Seasonable CONSIDERATIONS on a
NAVIGABLE CANAL intended to be cut
from the River TRENT, at Wilden-Ferry, in
the County of DERBY, to the River MER-
SEY, in the County of CHESTER.

THE opening a communication between the
ports of *Hull* and *Liverpool*, and uniting the eastern
D and

and western seas, must necessarily produce the most beneficial consequences; but this great and important scheme [if practicable] may be effectuated, and all the ends of *public utility* answered, by making a canal from the river *Trent*, at *Burton*, to the river *Weaver*, near *Northwich*, in the county of *Chester*.

This position is so indubitably clear, that no one (who is not entrusted with the secret counsels, which direct this arduous enterprize) can suggest any *just* reason, for entertaining even a wish, to extend the proposed canal to *Wilden Ferry* (sixteen miles below *Burton*) at the one end, or to the river *Mersey* (fourteen miles below *Northwich*) at the other.

In the course of these considerations, which are designed to convey an exact and comprehensive idea of the origin, progress and consequences of this vast undertaking, conjectures will be risked as to the real views which were to be answered by this *extraordinary* extension; but which, it cannot be doubted, the wisdom and justice of parliament will prevent.

The resolution of applying “for an Act to make
“ a navigable canal from *Wilden Ferry*, at the river
“ *Trent*, to the river *Mersey*” was declared at a public meeting (the only one appointed for the purpose) which was held at *Wolsley Bridge*, in *Staffordshire*, on the 30th of *December*, 1765.

Whether every branch of this mighty project was disclosed, to the gentlemen who were then convened; its real object, in its full and *true* extent, understood; or its minuter considerations entered into and discussed; certain it is, that it was universally conceived, *that the whole scheme was to be conducted by a company of proprietors*, who were to be erected into a *body politic* and corporate. If other ideas were secretly entertained, the Public has been egregiously misled.

In

In consequence of a petition of several gentlemen, land-owners, tradesmen, manufacturers and others, of the counties of *Lancaster*, *Chester*, *Stafford*, *Warwick*, *Derby*, *Leicester*, *Nottingham*, *Lincoln* and *York*, and the town and county of the town of *Kingston upon Hull*, presented on the 15th day of *January*, 1766, leave was given on *Friday* the 7th of *February*, to bring in a Bill, “for
 “making a navigable cut or canal from the river
 “*Trent*, at or near *Wilden Ferry* in the county of
 “*Derby*, to or near *Swarkstone* and *Willington* in the
 “said county, *Whicknor*, *Rudgley*, *Stone* and *Bur-*
 “*flem* in the county of *Stafford*, and from thence,
 “to or near *Lawton* and *Astbury* in the county of
 “*Chester*, and to the river *Mersey* ;” which on the 18th was read the first time, and on the 24th a second time, and committed.

Such has been the preliminary proceeding, and such the petition and the bill ; whose only *apparent* object is, “the cutting of a canal from *Wilden*
 “*Ferry* to the river *Mersey*, under the direction of a
 “company of proprietors.” But who could entertain a suspicion, that this petition, thus flowing from a public resolution, could privately usher in an extension or diversion of the Duke of *Bridgewater*’s canal,
 “from *Longford Bridge*, in the township of *Stretford*
 “in the county of *Lancaster*, to the *Hemp Stones* in
 “the county of *Chester* ?”

At the meeting, (the only one which preceded the application to parliament) the patrons of this scheme had neither ingenuity nor courage to disclose its full and real designation ; repeatedly called upon, they refused to declare, where this great canal was to terminate ; its commencement at *Wilden Ferry* they did venture to own ; the Public had been given

to understand, that * “ it was to join with the river
 “ *Weaver* in *Cheshire*,—or the Duke of *Bridgewater*’s
 “ navigation,—or the tide way in the river *Mersey*,
 “ as should be found most expedient ;” but not a
 suspicion was indulged, that the company of pro-
 prietors were to be united with his Grace the Duke
 of *Bridgewater* ;—*nor is it so much as known, where*
this favourite DIVERSION is to begin.

It is not a pleasant thing to conjecture, by what
 means his Grace (to whom nothing derogatory is
 intended) has been introduced into this Bill ; nor
 upon what principle, this darling proposition can
 possibly be retained ; and it may not be improper
 to enquire, by what daring presumption this strange
 authority found its way into the Bill.

If such was the use which was intended to have
 been made of a public application, it would have
 been manly to have declared it ; this duplicity is in-
 defensible ; in matters of such universal and essen-
 tial consequence to property, it is criminal ; it is a
 dangerous, mean and cowardly indecision, resulting
 from a well grounded apprehension, that the
 scheme itself would have been publickly disap-
 proved, had this branch of it even so much as trans-
 pired.

If the company of proprietors meant originally to
 stop at *Preston-Brook*, what encouragement, what
 countenance are *they* entitled to, who thus evince,
 that their undertaking is secondary to a design, which
 none of them have had the fortitude publicly to pa-
 tronize ? It might not perhaps be too bold to add,
 that by this single step they have forfeited all claim
 to every assistance from authority.

* See page 55 of the 1st part of this pamphlet, printed for
 T. Lowndes, in Fleet-street, price 2s. 6d.

Might it not be asked, whether these gentlemen were secretly jealous of some powerful opposition, which they wished to repel by this notable union with the Duke of Bridgewater?

If his Grace is desirous of diverting the course of his former canal, so as to terminate at *Runcorn-Gap* instead of the *Hempstones*, why not cut immediately to *Runcorn Gap*? Why sweep round to *Preston-Brook*? Does public utility require his Grace to interfere with *this* canal in any shape? Why are the company of proprietors prevented from carrying their canal (if it were necessary) to *Runcorn-Gap* at once? And let his Grace, in a future day, meet it there, and carry it over the *Mersey* to *Liverpool*, if he pleases; but let it be done in an open and constitutional manner, by a public petition to parliament, that every one whose inheritance will be invaded by the proposed diversion, may, in consequence of the just, necessary and usual notoriety, have an opportunity of defending his property, of which, by this mode of proceeding, he would be absolutely precluded.

In this place, it must be remarked, that *no petition* was presented, by his Grace the Duke of Bridgewater, *within the time* fixed for receiving petitions for private bills, which expired on the 15th of February.

The intended diversion, which cannot be effected without cutting through several miles of land which is not within the scope of the original petition, is, *to all intents* and purposes, the subject of a *private bill*;—and it is most humbly submitted, that no petition, for a private bill, which is not received within due time, can be proceeded upon, without violating the sacred and indispensable law of parliament.

This petition cannot, it is conceived, be defended as an auxiliary petition; the canal from the *Trent*

to the *Mersey* can certainly be completed without this connection with his Grace; whether the schemes of his Grace can be accomplished without this junction is a consideration foreign to this bill; in all events, even if it should promote the mutual interest of both canals, let it be the business of another session; let the great and essential rules of parliament remain unshaken; a relaxation in this single instance might produce a precedent fraught with the most alarming dangers. *Who* cannot suppose a case, in which, in after times, a similar deviation might be ushered in, with a pretext to the full as plausible as the present, by which the rights of thousands of innocent individuals might be infringed, without notice, without opposition, and without redress?

His Grace by his petition [*presented the 12th of March,—which is 25 days after the expiration of the time for receiving petitions for private bills*] states, “*that Runcorn-Gap*” [where the new canal is intended to terminate] “*at the river Mersey, is about two thousand and five hundred yards from the Hempstones, and that if his own canal were to be diverted*” [from going on four miles north-west to its original destination at the *Hempstones*] “*so as to communicate with the proposed canal*” [by an elbow of four miles south-west and one mile south] “*at Preston-Brook, and from thence to be carried on to Runcorn-Gap,*” [which will make his a new and different cut of nine miles] “*both navigations will be more compleat and convenient to the public.*”

It is not easy to suggest, why *Runcorn Gap* is stated to be *two thousand and five hundred yards* from the *Hempstones*; is it meant to impress a belief, that the diversion to *Preston-Brook* is of no greater distance? Hints have been dropt, that his Grace, under his former acts, is authorized to make any diversion within the compass of *two thousand yards*; is it intended

tended to be insinuated, that by the proposed diversion his Grace will only stretch about *five hundred yards* more?—His Grace has no power under any of his former acts, to divert the *lateral* course of his last canal *two thousand yards*; surely the wise commentators upon these laws do not consider the power delegated under his Grace's first act “to make any cut, trench, or sluice to convey coals or goods to his first canal, not exceeding *two thousand yards* in length, and *sixteen yards* in breadth” as an authority to alter the *lateral* course of any part of his last canal *two thousand yards* at his pleasure.

It is a palpable mistake, to say the best of it; but *Preston-Brook* is not within *two thousand five hundred yards* of the Duke's canal; nor can a diversion of five miles, (for four of which the freeholders of the lands which are to be cut through, and are not within the reach of the original petition, could not have the *regular* information of a scheme, which so nearly affects them,) be possibly covered by any of the authorities claimed by his Grace under his former acts, nor introduced by an auxiliary petition, nor can, in the nature of things, be adopted by parliament, but as the subject of a private bill. The treaty which the company of proprietors have so happily concluded with his Grace, cannot, it is presumed, obviate this difficulty.

The manner of attempting this very dangerous innovation is sufficient to awaken jealousy and excite caution.

This deviation from the avowed plan of the bill, will, we hope, be considered as an absolute departure from the petition.

This bill (were the clauses which affect the Duke of *Bridgewater* even to be dropt) seems, with all due deference, to be extremely defective and indigested, and it is submitted to the honour and candour of its patrons, whether they will pursue it any farther in

this session, especially as there is no necessity of precipitating an undertaking, which necessarily affects the properties of so many gentlemen, whose estates, in so vast a tract, are to be cut through and separated; and reason and justice demand, that it should receive, in every point of view, all possible deliberation; and perhaps in a sober and dispassionate revision, some conciliating expedients may be hit upon, to reconcile even his Grace's proposition, without jealousy and without offence to either side.

To this indulgence a considerable number of gentlemen, whose properties are essentially concerned, are bold to consider themselves entitled; and take occasion to declare, (and will in due season testify in a more solemn manner,) * “ *that no private interest*
 “ *actuates them to form a design either injurious to the*
 “ *adjacent countries, or detrimental to the noble Duke*
 “ *whose uncommon spirit*” they profess to admire. They are superior to every petty and every personal consideration; they scorn to propagate illiberal invectives, and despise the low and paltry art of misleading the public judgment by † “ *calumny founded*
 “ *upon falsehood.*”

The warmest partisan of the bill will not venture to assert, that this very extensive and very complicated undertaking has, in the usual manner of proceedings of a like nature, been so frequently discussed at public county meetings, with the solemnity and deliberation equal to the many important consequences which must result from it; and it is upon this consideration (with many more of great weight) that it is sincerely wished, that the whole matter could be deferred, so as to be re-viewed and corrected with the most decisive attention.

But if this wish should not prevail, the case of those, who conceived themselves injured, will, it is

* See pamphlet, part 1st, page 76.

† Ditto, page 80.

not doubted, be duly weighed and considered by a House of Commons, who will not take any man's freehold from him, without full and adequate compensation, nor without evident and irresistible proof of real and imminent necessity, supported by the fundamental principle of public utility.

If this bill must in all events be *now* carried through, it is presumed, that *a series of amendments* which are indeed many in number, and dictated by the nature of the case, (though perhaps not expected by the friends of the bill) but founded in reason and in justice,—will be introduced under the auspices of the honourable House of Commons.

So peculiar has been the fate of this wonderful project, that, in the very first print of the bill, its known, avowed, original destination is varied by a species of management, neither very usual, nor very commendable in public transactions.

By the first enacting clause, [page 2 and 3.] the company of proprietors are “empowered to cut a canal from *Wilden Ferry* at the river *Trent* to the river *Mersey*,” but the whole of this power is continued to them no longer, than whilst they travel to page 40, where they are stripped of five miles of their canal; their plan is *there* circumscribed, and their authority divided with the Duke of *Bridgewater*, who is, it seems, to divert the original course of his canal, (which was to terminate at the *Hempstones*,) in order to meet the new canal at *Preston-Brook*, and from thence to carry it on to *Runcorn-Gap*, at the *Mersey*.

Will not this in effect be *two* private bills founded upon *one* petition? Does not the adoption of his Grace exceed the line of *reference* to the committee? Does the original petition authorise any proceeding, abstracted from *a power to the company* of proprietors of cutting the whole canal? Does the bill in this point follow

follow the prayer of the petition? Is a competent notoriety of the proposed innovation conveyed by the title of this bill? Will not this interesting, secret, and unexampled diversion, if countenanced upon this occasion, establish a precedent big with danger?

The canal, by this bill, proposed to be made from *Wilden-Ferry* to the *Mersey*, is near 100 miles in length.

The western part of the *Trent*, from *Wilden-Ferry* to *Burton* (which is near 16 miles) is *already* navigable under an act of parliament of the 10th and 11th of King William III.

The new canal is intended to run nearly parallel with this navigation, for sixteen miles together, never more than a mile distance, but often less than half a mile.

From *Witton-Bridge* near *Northwich* to the *Mersey*, which is about fifteen miles, there is an excellent navigable river which was made under an act of parliament of the 7th of King *George* the First. The proposed canal is to run nearly parallel with this river for fifteen miles together; in some part of it within the distance of one hundred yards.

Public utility is the charm which is to conquer all things; a communication between *Hull* and *Liverpool*, and uniting the eastern and western seas is an enterprise which may have public utility for its object; but this communication cannot [Messrs. Agents and Engineers say] be effected without beginning at *Wilden-Ferry* and terminating at *Runcorn Gap*; by cutting the great *Trunk* between *Burton* and *Northwich*, (which would save these projectors full forty thousand pounds, and preserve from depredation two ancient, established and effectual navigations,) their ideas of public utility will not be answered. The communication must not be opened, according to
their

their schemes, by the just medium of the old navigations.

A capital of near forty thousand pounds employed in these two navigations is an object beneath the attention of these gentlemen, who have not condescended even to treat for a compensation for the injury that may arise to the proprietors; but we trust, that they will be taught, by the wise and just decision of parliament, that no man's property shall be unnecessarily depreciated, nor large estates wantonly devasted, to try a project, whose event is uncertain, depending upon *fallacious* and indefinite estimates, and the contributions of numbers, who perhaps, *when more enlightened*, may abandon a scheme, which they have been prevailed upon to assist, by plausible but erroneous arguments of public utility, and a glaring deception of its *real* destination.

It may not be amiss to remark, that the company of proprietors stopping at *Preston-Brook*, seem to have conceded, that a further limitation of their plan may prevail; it is therefore hoped, that they will be confined between *Burton* and *Northwich*; let *that* be the extent of the canal; in a tract of seventy miles, they may find room to employ their money and to try an experiment; and it may be equally just to extend a seasonable and friendly concern to high and illustrious personages, by setting limits to dangerous and expensive undertakings, and delivering them from the baneful influence of interested and daring projectors.

In support of this idea, wisdom and justice seem to dictate, that these gentlemen should not be, on any consideration, permitted, *at present*, to meddle with any estates beyond *Northwich* or *Burton*, especially as they own, that * “the water which is chiefly

* See first part, page 58.

“ to support this canal is to be drawn by a grand
 “ cut to be made at *Hare-Castle*, twenty miles south
 “ of *Northwich*, which is the highest part in the
 “ course of the canal, and where the water falls north
 “ and south, and where this canal is to be carried
 “ above a full mile under ground.”

Suppose this branch of the project should miscarry, (and many people, who, in point of judgment, capacity and experience, equal *at least* to the ablest of the managers, are not clear in their ideas of its practicability,) what a dreadful situation will the land-owners be in, whose estates will have been separated, mangled, and perhaps spoiled, beyond all possibility of reparation?

Are not these considerations, which should influence those who are invested with authority, to keep a severe and jealous eye upon so dangerous and so important an undertaking,—whose fate thus entirely depends upon speculation.

Is not the preservation of a tract of land for thirty miles, from insolent, cruel and unnecessary devastation, an object worthy of the attention of parliament? Is not a delegation of power to invade all property indiscriminately, for seventy miles together, enough to be entrusted with *any* class of undertakers *at once*?

Are these gentlemen jealous, that when they shall have effected their canal from *Burton* to *Northwich*, the legislature in after times will be less benign to them, and *unkindly* withhold from them an authority to extend it at both ends, when they will have clear and decisive proof of the *practicability* of their scheme, the *necessity* of the desired extension, and the *real* public *utility* which will flow from it? Are they fearful, that these weighty considerations will not receive their merited attention from a future parliament? Or do they entertain such an overweening affection for the public, that they dread, that whilst
 they

they are cutting the great trunk, some dire catastrophe will destroy her happiness, *the Trent* at the one end, and *the Weaver* at the other, become dry, and the *navigations useless*, and consequently their darling communication between *Hull* and *Liverpool* retarded, unless they can execute their whole plan at once?

But let these gentlemen be asked, whether the communication between *Hull* and *Liverpool* will not be, to all intents and purposes, as effectual, and every consideration of public utility answered, if the proposed canal were to be confined between *Burton* and *Northwich*? Would not * “a great expence be saved, and” many “needless damages avoided?” Does *public utility* require any junction with the Duke of *Bridgewater*? Will not the communication between *Hull* and *Liverpool* be accelerated, [if the scheme be in its nature practicable,] were the undertakers restrained to the cutting of the canal between *Northwich* and *Burton*? What necessity can be urged for passing a law, for cutting the *whole* canal, in this session?

The owners and trustees of the *Burton* and *Northwich* navigations, alarmed at the impending danger which threatens them, find themselves under an indispensable necessity of laying their case before parliament, under *whose faith* they hold their properties, and *whose protection* they are not conscious of having in any instance forfeited. Without patronage, without connections, and without even wishing for any other support than what the equity and justice of their case demand, they trust that their humble remonstrances will procure them the attention and relief of parliament, in whose wisdom and justice they have a dutiful and perfect reliance. Though their

* See first part, page 82.

enemies are *mighty*, it is humbly presumed, that their schemes require only to be clearly *understood*, in order to be *defeated*.

The owners of the old navigations conceive, that they ought to repel the invidious imputation of bearing unkind ideas to the great scheme of opening a communication between the ports of *Hull* and *Liverpool*. They are bound in justice to declare themselves sincere and zealous friends to that public, useful and arduous undertaking; but they are free to contend, that the plan now under consideration is unfairly and unnecessarily extended; and they flatter themselves that they shall neither incur censure, nor provoke resentment, by endeavouring to guard their properties from unjust, capricious, and injurious violation.

The views of these projectors may, in some degree, be penetrated, and their arguments anticipated, by the *able* and *curious* publications, which have, in *different shapes*, appeared upon this occasion. Such as are *worth* notice will be remarked upon.

It is insisted, “ that the canal navigation will be
“ better than the river navigation between *Wilden*
“ and *Burton*,” but let it be observed, that the navigation between *Burton* and *Wilden* is, in *all respects*, better than the navigation between *Wilden* and *Gainsborough*, which is near *ninety* miles; and the argument holds much stronger for extending the canal even to *Gainsborough*, than for stopping at *Wilden Ferry*.

The reason urged * “ for falling in at *Wilden* rather than *Burton*” is “ to avoid the shallows,
“ which greatly interrupt the navigation on that river.”

* See part 1st, page 57.

The shallows are fewer in proportion between *Burton* and *Wilden* than between *Wilden* and *Gainsborough*; and the boats which go from *Burton* are from thirty to forty tons burthen, and are to the full as large as any that are navigated from *Wilden*, *Nottingham*, or any other place below *Burton*.

More goods are carried upon an average between *Burton* and *Wilden* than between *Wilden* and *Gainsborough*; and where any lightening is necessary, it generally happens at the shallows below *Wilden-Ferry*.

Boats have frequently run from *Burton* to *Gainsborough*, and back to *Burton*, which is two hundred and twelve miles, in seven days; the voyage is performed in twelve days, upon an average, including two days for loading and delivering.

In order to diffuse ungenerous prejudices, and to divert and mislead that sober enquiry, which is so seriously desired, and is so essential to this great subject, insinuations have been dropt, that the navigation between *Burton* and *Wilden* is a monopoly; but let it be remarked, that this is a consideration foreign to the merits of this bill; and those, who are intended to be affected by the imputation, are far from wishing to shield their conduct from a parliamentary examination; and they engage to prove, that the business of this navigation is executed with care, fidelity, dispatch, and *acknowledged* propriety.

Trade may be carried on between *Burton* and *Wilden* with at least *equal expedition*, and *considerably cheaper*, by the river, than it ever can be by the canal.

* “ The reasons” [the projectors say] “ for
“ preferring a canal to a river navigation are many
“ and important. The shortness of the voyage on

* See 1st part, page 56.

“ the former, which is protracted on the latter by
 “ the winding course of the stream ; the absence of
 “ currents which in rivers impede the upward navi-
 “ gation, more than they assist the downward ; and
 “ hourly undermine and wear away the banks ; and
 “ the security from mischief and delay occasioned by
 “ the floods.”

Why will the voyage be much shorter by a canal than a river navigation ? Does not the canal run down the same valley with the river ? Must not every great winding of the river be nearly the same in the canal ? Will not a voyage be made as soon on the river as on the canal, boats being assisted by the stream downwards, and upwards frequently by winds ?

Must not the mischief and delay be the same, whether the canal falls in at *Wilden-Ferry* or *Burton*, as boats can always work from *Burton* down to *Wilden-Ferry*, ready to go forward from thence, by the time the river is in condition for boats to work below *Wilden* ? Is not a canal sooner affected by frost ?

“ An easier draught” [Messrs. Projectors insist]
 “ will be made for the horses, as the boats will in a
 “ canal move nearer the towing-path ; and the ad-
 “ vantage in choosing high ground for the locks,
 “ whilst, in the other case, the situation of them
 “ must be regulated only by the accidental shallows
 “ of the rivers ; and in river navigations, the locks
 “ being frequently erected on low lands, the neigh-
 “ bouring meadows are thereby often rendered
 “ damp, and swampy.”

This grave and pitiful argument is beneath refutation.

“ It is also” [say they] “ another circumstance
 “ not unworthy of notice in favour of canals, when
 “ compared with river navigations, that as the con-
 “ veyance upon the former is more speedy, and
 “ without

“ without the interruptions and delays, to which
 “ the latter are very liable ; opportunities of pilfer-
 “ ing earthen wares, and other small goods, and
 “ stealing and adulterating wine and spirituous li-
 “ quors, are thereby in a great measure prevented.
 “ The losses, disappointments, and discredit of the
 “ manufacturers arising from this cause are so great,
 “ that they frequently chuse to send their goods by
 “ land, at three times the expence of water-car-
 “ riage, and sometimes even refuse to supply their
 “ orders at all, rather than run the risque of for-
 “ feiting their credit, and submitting to the deduc-
 “ tions that are made on this account.”

As we are not yet let into the secret, why watermen, who work upon canals, are necessarily honest than those who are employed upon rivers, this article must pass unanswered.

The next advantages, which are recounted, are the superiority over land-carriage, [by an estimate which indeed is widely exaggerated,] and the beneficial communication of the neighbouring counties ; but surely these gentlemen will not venture so far to insult common sense, as to deny, that all these great, glorious and patriotic consequences would follow, if the canal should be confined between *Burton* and *Northwich*.

Is it contended, that the navigation between *Burton* and *Wilden* is a bad one ? Can it be *improved*, should the water be taken out of the *Trent* above *Burton*, and not returned till it comes *below Wilden* ? Does not every brook and spring, which are to be cut through, *now* empty themselves into the *Trent* ? And if these are to be diverted into the new canal, must not the *Burton* navigation be extremely prejudiced by this irreparable loss of water ?

Must not the inconveniences of floods and re-ship-
ping be the same at *Wilden* as at *Burton* ?

E

No

No argument, *justly and fairly* drawn from Considerations of *public necessity*, and *public convenience*, can be produced in favour of this extention.

Will public utility be promoted, by permitting the company of proprietors to demand a tonnage of two shillings, between Burton and Wilden-Ferry, when the old undertakers are entitled only to three pence?

The *Liverpool* river to *Frodsham-Bridge* (being about seventeen miles) is naturally navigable; and the river *Weaver*, from *Frodsham-Bridge* to *Northwich*, (being about fifteen miles) and from *Northwich* to *Winsford-Bridge*, (about seven miles more) is already navigable by locks set upon that river; so that a navigation from *Liverpool* is already extended towards the *Trent* near thirty nine miles.

This navigation will completely answer all *public* purposes, as the tonnage will be very considerably lower than upon the canal; heavy goods from *Liverpool* to *Winsford-Bridge* pay only ten pence *per* ton; others twelve pence; and the highest only one shilling and three pence; and in nine years more, it cannot exceed one shilling *per* ton.

A communication between *Hull* and *Liverpool* may be more easily and more beneficially opened, by a canal from *Winsford-Bridge* by *Checkley Brook*, near *Wrine-Hill*, which may be extended by *Stafford*, below *Shutborough*, to the *Trent*; or by *Newcastle*; or by *Burslem*.

The advantages, which the *public* would derive from a communication between *Hull* and *Liverpool*, were it effected by the canal, which has been hinted at, are many and obvious. Suffice it *now* to observe, that the tonnage between *Winsford-Bridge* and *Checkley Brook* (which is twenty-one miles) will not exceed one shilling, and between *Winsford-Bridge* and *Frodsham-Bridge* (which is twenty-two miles) one shilling more; *in all, two shillings*; whereas the
tonnage,

tonnage, for *forty-three miles* upon the new canal, may amount to *five shillings and four pence halfpenny*. The whole *freight and tonnage* of heavy goods from *Checkley Brook* to *Liverpool* (which is near *sixty miles*) will scarcely amount to *six shillings* per ton!

A canal from the *Trent* to the port of *Chester* might be made at a much less expence to the undertakers, and less prejudice to private property, than the proposed canal from *Wilden Ferry* to *Runcorn Gap*.

There are now between eighty and ninety vessels, from forty to fifty tons burthen, employed upon the river between *Liverpool*, *Northwich* and *Winsford*; and some of the vessels, after stopping and clearing out at the Custom House in *Liverpool*, proceeded to the Welch coasts, and to *Lancaster* and *Whitehaven*.

Vessels between *Liverpool* and *Frodsham Bridge* come and return with the tide, and sometimes make that passage in three or four hours: are usually about six hours in passing between the lowest lock near *Frodsham Bridge* and *Northwich*; and about the same time between *Northwich* and *Winsford Bridge*. They pass through a lock in about five minutes. Seventy thousand tons of goods, upon an average, are carried yearly upon this river.

The vessels could carry a much greater quantity, and may be increased, if the trade required it; but their navigation must severely suffer indeed, if the water of the river is taken from it, by diverting its streams into the new canal; and no water can be collected from *Harecastle* towards *Runcorn Gap*, but what must be diverted from the river *Weaver*.

If the new undertakers will assert, that the *Weaver* navigation is liable to objection on account of floods, it may be answered, that this inconvenience may effectually be removed by making two additional

locks ; and upon the whole, this navigation is more commodious to the Public than any canal can be ; but this useful and advantageous convenience cannot be long preserved to society, if the water is to be intercepted, and the tolls destroyed, by this dangerous and ruinous project.

It has been intimated, “ that the river *Weaver* “ at *Frodsham Bridge* sometimes wants water at neap “ tides ;” but this is by no means peculiar to *Frodsham Bridge* ; the *Mersey* at a considerable distance below sometimes wants water ; and whenever vessels can work to the *Hemp Stones* or *Runcorn Gap*, they may go to *Frodsham Bridge* and *Northwich*.

[This idea we apprehend is started, merely to induce a belief of the necessity and expediency of carrying the new canal from *Runcorn Gap* over the *Mersey* to *Liverpool*.] The scheme of carrying the proposed canal over the *Mersey* at *Runcorn Gap*, if not impracticable, is, at least in the highest degree dangerous.

The navigation at *Runcorn Gap* is a natural one ; but it must be liable to the most fatal interruptions, if an aqueduct should be attempted to be carried over it.

The river is in that part *five hundred and sixty yards* wide ; and at spring tides, the water flows near *eighteen* perpendicular feet. The masts of vessels of ninety tons burthen are near seventy feet high ; there is now scarcely sea room, and vessels are sometimes driven upon the sands. Now what must be the situation, if an aqueduct, supported by piers and arches, should be made there ? Will it not necessarily ruin the navigation of the *Mersey* from *Liverpool* to *Warrington*, *Sankey* and *Manchester* ? Will it not expose vessels of forty, fifty and sixty tons (which pass there near eight thousand times a year) to the most dreadful and incessant dangers ?

Were

Were it either practicable or convenient to make an aqueduct over *Runcorn Gap*, and continue a canal to *Liverpool*, the expence would necessarily occasion so high a tonnage, that goods would be always carried *cheaper* by the old navigations.

To the objections against this branch of the extension, we beg leave to add an humble conjecture, that the proprietors of the canal, proposed to be cut from the *Trent*, *were they at liberty to pursue either their inclination or their interest*, would most chearfully have joined the *Weaver* at *Northwich*, especially as permission has been offered to them to navigate by that river to the *Mersey* at *six pence per ton*. This junction would have relieved them of the most expensive and most invidious part of the enterprize. Every *real* and *fair* advantage would have been secured to the Public; and if these gentlemen cannot embrace this proposition, it must be imputed to difficulties *foreign to their wishes* and the *true end* of their undertaking.

Will not the Public be highly injured, if the navigation between Witton Bridge and the Mersey (by the canal) is liable to a tonnage of ONE SHILLING AND EIGHT PENCE, when all goods might be carried from the same canal, by the river Weaver to the Mersey for SIX PENCE per Ton?

The managers of this extraordinary Bill are fond of impressing an opinion, “that a *new* communication will be opened with the eastern and northern counties, were the proposed canal to meet the Duke of *Bridgewater*’s at *Preston Brook*.” But are these gentlemen ignorant (or do they wish that others should be so) that a more effectual and advantageous communication with *Manchester*, and even *Stockport* and *Macclesfield*, and all the great trading towns in *Cheshire*, will be compleated by the new canal, which is intended to be made, by a Bill which has passed the honourable House of Commons,

“ for cutting a canal directly from *Witton Bridge* to *Knutsford*, *Macclesfield*, *Stockport* and *Manchester* ;” and which it is not doubted will soon pass into a law, as it *really* stands upon the laudable and immoveable basis of public utility ?

If these gentlemen should presume to controvert this point, or endeavour to establish an argument in favour of *their own* navigation from *Witton Bridge* to *Preston Brook*, and along his Grace’s canal to *Manchester*, on account of there being no lock, it has been observed, *that a lock may be passed in about five minutes* ; and it is irresistibly evident, that boats may go from *Witton Bridge* to *Manchester*, by this canal, with nearly the *same expedition*, and at the *same expence in freightage*, and with a *saving of more than thirty per cent. in the article of tonnage*.

The subscribers to the new canal are entitled only to a tonnage of *two shillings and six pence* from *Witton Bridge* to *Manchester* ; and only *two shillings and three pence* to *Stockport* ; whereas by the proposed canal from the *Trent*, a tonnage of *one shilling and three pence* may be demanded from the intersection of the two canals about a mile above *Witton Bridge* to *Preston Brook* ; and the *tonnage* upon any part of his Grace the Duke of *Bridgwater’s canal* is full *two shillings and six pence* more.

These projectors should be reminded too, that by the canal which is to be cut directly from *Witton Bridge* to *Manchester*, a *new and very useful* communication will be opened with the north-east parts of the county of *Chester* ; that the greatest part of the county, through which this canal is to be cut, is very populous ; where several valuable manufactures are carried on ; that many articles of these manufactures may be more easily conveyed to *Liverpool*, and from one market-town to another ; that it will facilitate the conveyance of all merchandize between the river

Weaver

Weaver and the towns of *Knutsford* and *Macclesfield*, and from thence to the adjacent parts of *Derbyshire*;—of salt from *Norwich* to *Knutsford*, *Macclesfield*, *Stockport* and *Manchester*;—of wheat, flour and oat-meal, and other produce, to *Stockport* and *Manchester*, for the supply of those markets, and the adjacent towns and manufacturing countries;—of coals from the collieries at *Norbury* and near *Stockport*, to that town, and to *Macclesfield* and *Knutsford*;—of lime from *Macclesfield* to *Manchester*, *Stockport*, *Knutsford* and *Northwich*, and the adjacent countries, for building, and the improvement of land;—of slate and flag from the quarries near *Macclesfield*, and of stone and other materials for the repair of *highways*;—and will be attended with many other conveniencies, which cannot arise from the canal from the *Trent*, or from the Duke of *Bridgwater's* canal, even though a Branch was to be made from *Cheadle* to *Macclesfield*;—in a word, that it will produce all the *real* and extensive advantages of an inland navigation, without being liable to an imputation of *oppression* and *injustice*, by cutting a canal, parallel for many miles with an old and useful navigation.

This navigation will neither obstruct the canal from the *Trent* (which it crosses a mile from *Witton Bridge*) nor the Duke's near *Stockport*; as the Bill directs, “that the canal from *Witton Bridge* be
“made *nineteen feet below* the *Trent* canal, and *twenty*
“*feet above* his Grace's, at the places where they
“are to cross.”

A cut from *Cheadle* to *Macclesfield* has been proposed, with the evident view of preventing a communication between the navigation of the *Weaver* and the several towns which have been mentioned, and between those towns with each other; and the owners of collieries in and near *Norbury*, from sup-

plying those places with coals, to the prejudice of his Grace, who by his own act is under no restraint as to price, beyond *Manchester*.

Is it either just or reasonable, that the Duke should extend his canal, at his pleasure, through the lands of gentlemen in *Cheshire*, in order to bring his coals to a better market; and these very gentlemen be denied the liberty of making a canal to supply their neighbours with their own coals, which they might afford to sell at a much cheaper rate? Are not the *Norbury coals*, though brought to *Stockport* by land carriage, sold as cheap as the Duke's at *Altrincham* or *Manchester*? Will not the owners of the collieries in or near *Norbury*, be able to reduce the price of coals at *Stockport*, and the adjacent country, when brought by the proposed canal? Could they not supply the adjacent country, much cheaper than the Duke?

Is the Duke's boasted reduction of the price of coals at *Manchester* from four pence to three pence half penny per hundred, the effect of *choice* or *necessity*? Are not other coals, with which great part of that town is now supplied, brought there by land carriage?

Is not the Duke, by reason of his high tonnage, likely to continue the sole carrier upon his own canal; and must he not become the sole carrier upon all branches from it?

May not his Grace's agents, if branches be thus multiplied from his canal (*abusing his confidence*) by degrees, monopolize the corn, flour, meal, and other necessaries, dispose of them at his own warehouses, without bringing them to market, and make his Grace's exclusive privilege of water carriage the instrument of the most outrageous exactions?

Might not his Grace's monopolizing the canal navigations of these countries, be *one day*, the source
of

of the most extensive and alarming inconveniences?

The peculiar and undeniable superiority of the canal that is proposed to be cut directly from *Witton Bridge to Manchester*, is the establishing a *new communication*; and the Duke of *Bridgwater's* canal (if it were to be diverted to the *Mersey* above, or to the *Weaver* below, *Frodsbam Bridge*, instead of terminating either at the *Hemp Stones* or *Runcorn Gap*) may easily communicate with the canal, which is intended to be cut from the *Trent*, should the wisdom of parliament fix its boundaries between *Burton* and *Northwich*; and rescue two established navigations from ruin, and thirty miles of land from hostile, unnecessary and grievous incursions.

The Duke of *Bridgwater's* panegyrists loudly extol the generosity of his Grace in “extending his canal from *Sale Moor* to *Stockport*, about seven miles, without the consideration of any additional tonnage;” and for which he has obtained an act of parliament in this session, *without any opposition*. But surely these gentlemen ought not to have concealed, that by this very act his Grace is entitled to the same tonnage, for these seven miles, as from *Manchester* to the *Hemp Stones*; and they should have added, that the whole tonnage of two shillings and sixpence is payable, if a vessel so much as touches upon any part of his Grace's canals. We are anxiously desirous to do justice to the personal worth of his Grace, and have too high a sense of it to harbour even a suspicion, that he would deign to accept a compliment, which is founded in fallacy.

The extension, which is now opposed, we do not hesitate to repeat, neither is, nor *can be* supported by a *single* argument, fairly drawn from considerations of public *justice*, public *necessity*, or public *convenience*; but we could easily assign *private* reasons

reasons in abundance; some of which it behoves us to mention.

It cannot be doubted, that his Grace the Duke of *Bridgwater*, by not locking down at the *Hemp stones*, according to the original termination of his canal, will be relieved of an expence of many thousand pounds; and it is equally certain, that his Grace, by keeping so high a level, cannot mean to incur this expence, by locking down at *Runcorn Gap*, where he now wishes, that his own and the new canal should terminate; because boats, which are navigated upon the canal could not live there; and it must evidently be his Grace's intention only to crane the goods down for the present; and in after times, to carry an aqueduct over *Runcorn Gap*, and to continue his canal to *Liverpool*; a project, which we apprehend must necessarily involve the destruction of all the navigations, which now communicate with this branch of the river *Mersey*.

Are not wisdom and justice called upon to preclude all flattering expectations of countenance to this mighty but dangerous enterprize, by preventing the proposed canal from being carried at an enormous expence, to *Runcorn Gap*, with such an object avowedly in contemplation?

Add to this, by this union with the *Trent* canal at *Preston Brook*, his Grace will not only entirely command the carriage of salt and all other goods, which shall be navigated from *Middlewich* to *Manchester* [if the scheme of cutting a canal directly “from *Wilton Bridge* to *Knutsford*, *Macclesfield*, “*Stockport*, and *Manchester*” should, contrary to all expectation, miscarry;] but by this very Bill a new tonnage is given to him upon all goods, which shall be carried by the *Trent* canal to the river *Mersey*, or down his own canal to *Manchester*. In fine, if this unfortunate extention should take place, and
the

the other communication (*by any unforeseen accident*) be defeated, his grace must necessarily engross all the canal carriage of these countries.

These are a few of the many *private* advantages which will result from the extention; but we flatter ourselves, that it is incontestibly clear, that it has no foundation either in *public utility*, or *public justice*.

Should it be asked, What have the proprietors and trustees to fear, if business can be done better and cheaper by the old navigation than by the canal? They beg leave to answer, that the company of proprietors may engross the freight upon the canal between *Burton* and *Northwich*, and consequently carry all the goods below the old navigations; the effects of which are too obvious to need explanation.

We cannot dismiss these considerations, without taking notice of the very singular fallacies, which were made use of, in order to procure a public sanction to this *grand* enterprize.

At the public meeting, on the 30th of *December*, the country gentlemen were allured with an expectation of the proposed canal going nearly in a line from *Hare Castle* to *Agden*.

Great public advantages would have flowed from this destination; *which* gentlemen imagined they were promoting. By this course, many thousand pounds would have been saved; and none but the agents and engineers (whose work would have been sooner compleated) have suffered; and perhaps they themselves would have found very *handsome* recompence by their coal, from the mines and estates, which they have purchased near *Hare Castle*, in expectation of this new canal being cut from the *Trent* to the *Mersey*.

Thus

Thus was public approbation snapped by a most intolerable piece of disingenuity ; and if these extraordinary projectors are solicitous to efface the imputation, and to “ *assert their Right to general Confidence* ;” let them be asked, Why in the very title of this bill, *as it now stands*, is the course of the canal carried “ *to or near Lawton and Astbury*,” when it is not *really* intended to reach within four miles at least of *Astbury* ? Is this expression retained, merely to continue the delusion, and, by a dexterous ambiguity, to lull the country gentlemen into a belief, that the canal will still be carried to *Agden*, according to its original designation ?

Were they afraid to name, either in their petition, or in the title of their bill, any town beyond *Astbury*, lest the fallacy should have been detected ?

This branch of the scheme would have eminently assisted the purposes of *public utility*, though at the expence of *private interests*, too considerable and important to be easily resisted ; in the first place, his Grace the Duke of *Bridgewater* could not have secured to himself advantages, equal to his meeting the canal at *Preston-Brook*, where all the lucrative tonnage must necessarily center ; besides, by carrying the canal *over the Mersey near Agden*, it would run through a coal country, and might give birth to a disagreeable competition with his grace’s coal trade.

It is matter of general amazement, that any set of gentlemen should venture to apply to parliament to carry a project into execution, which must unavoidably produce such terrible and extreme consequences to private property ;—without having previously made an actual Survey ;—and without apprizing those, who are likely to be affected, otherwise than by a series of *imperfect, erroneous, fallacious and inconsistent* plans, laid down by a scale of only a quarter

ter of an inch to a mile.—Ought not a plan to have been made upon a scale of at least one inch to a mile ;—describing with minute and exact precision the true course and windings of the rivers and of the canal,—the extent of each person's property which is to be cut through,—the quality of the land ; the distances from the mansion houses of gentlemen of fortune ;—with the levels clearly ascertained, and the expence of cutting this canal, and calculation of the quantity of goods to be carried from different places, estimated ; in order that the rate of tonnage might be equitably and justly fixed ?

Seeing what they see, have not gentlemen every reason to be jealous of the extraordinary powers which these projectors are likely to be invested with ? *Who* will be able, in the present indefinite state of things, to check or controul them, if they should presume to deviate from what they *now* find it convenient to avow *for a Day* as the real course of their canal ? Are or can they be restrained from elbowing, at their pleasure, “ to meet any spring, brook, “ stream, or watercourse, within the distance of five “ hundred,” *or even five thousand* “ Yards ?”

Are they not at full liberty to cut and vary the course of the canal, where they please, provided it goes near “ *Wilden Ferry*, to or near *Swarkstone* and “ *Willington*,—*Whicknor*, *Rudgley*, *Stone* and *Burs-* “ *lem*, and through or near *Lawton*, *Astbury*, *Mid-* “ *dlewich*, and near *Northwich*, to the river *Mer-* “ *sey* ?”

Might not this authority, thus uncircumscribed, be used as a rod to terrify a stubborn freeholder, bravely engaged in defence of his property, into an acquiescence under the most dreadful and arbitrary impositions ? We shall not enlarge upon this point ; we shall leave gentlemen to consider the consequences,

Can

Can human wisdom, under these circumstances form any estimate, which is, can, or ought to be depended upon? Was not the sum of *one hundred and one thousand* pounds named at the meeting at *Wolsley Bridge* as the extent of the expence? has not a *great, able and accurate* engineer since informed us, “ that the estimate will amount to *one hundred and thirty three thousand* and ELEVEN HUNDRED “ pounds?”

The bill indeed permits these gentlemen to go as far as one hundred and fifty thousand pounds; but have they been acquainted, that their wise engineer has valued land at ten pounds per acre, which is beyond all dispute worth FORTY GUINEAS?

Let them pause for a little upon the credit, which is due to their estimate, before they embark in this very difficult undertaking; they doubtless will find, and perhaps by this time are sensible that it is *their true* interest, to postpone the whole scheme till another season.

Surely these gentlemen are not so vain as to flatter themselves, that when their estimates shall have been found widely disproportionate to the real expences, and their thousands will have been dissipated, in an ineffectual attempt to cut through and procure sufficient water from *Hare Castle*, they shall be able, *by cutting their canal at both ends*, to repair this sad misfortune, at the expence of the old navigations. If they indulge such chimerical expectations, we are bold to testify our perfect confidence, that by this bill, all these unjust and ridiculous hopes will be precluded; that these Gentlemen will not be entrusted, upon this occasion, with any authority to go below either *Burton* or *Northwich*. When they shall have cut this great trunk; (and we shall not tremble much, if our misfortune is not to visit us till that day;) when they shall have completely opened a commu-

communication between *Hull* and *Liverpool*, which this just and necessary limitation of their plan will undoubtedly hasten ; then, loaded with merit and honour, let them apply to parliament, for leave to make the extension ; when they would certainly meet with the *reception*, which will be *due* to them.

If the proprietors of the new canal should not be tied down in this article, by the most solemn restrictions ; the old navigations must be exposed to certain and irretrievable ruin ; and the communication between the ports of *Hull* and *Liverpool*, *by means of this canal*, in all human probability left uncompleted.

These are considerations which we comfort ourselves will meet with the peculiar and watchful attention of parliament ; who will not suffer the property of the meanest individual to be unjustly sacrificed.

It is upon these principles, that the owners and trustees of the *Burton* and *Weaver* navigations implore protection in this critical and decisive conjuncture—They have undertaken to demonstrate, that their properties *may remain untouched and unviolated* ; and no system of *public utility be interrupted*.

Free from every impression of private malevolence, they are anxiously desirous of guarding these humble considerations, against every possible construction of a personal attack upon his Grace the Duke of *Bridgewater* ; to whom they bear that just veneration and respect, which are due to an high and exalted character ; and they know, that his Grace is actuated by sentiments too noble and too generous, to suffer his indignation to be enflamed by an opposition which duty, interest and necessity have combined to dictate ; or by a denial of his
Grace's

Grace's *exclusive right to canal navigation*, of which he is not the original inventor.

Far from harbouring any idea, in the remotest degree, unfriendly to the many great, illustrious, and truly laudable enterprizes of that nobleman, we only wish to confine them within *just* and *proper* limits ; and we presume to hope, that the *splendor* of his projects will not intercept a *just* attention to the *consequences* of them. But if engineers have encouraged a profusion of expence in former schemes, which have not answered, surely they ought not to retrieve their miscarriage, (however essential to a continuance of favour and confidence,) with the vitals of innocent individuals.

The owners and trustees of the old navigations beg leave, in all events, to submit, “ that the tonnage, collected by the company of proprietors, ought to be equal, through the whole canal, for every species of goods ; with some particular exceptions.”

The bill provides for fixing an equal tonnage, through the whole canal, at the first meeting of the proprietors ; and authorizes them to fall and raise them as occasion should offer ; with the concurrence of commissioners.

If these gentlemen should succeed in fixing *different* tolls on *different* species of goods, a dreadful extent of mischief must follow ; because by imposing a very low tonnage for all the *staple articles* of the old navigations, they must necessarily be stripped of all their trade ; and when these are irreparably destroyed, and every possibility of their contest ceases, a *friendly* meeting of commissioners may raise and even perpetuate the tonnage, at the highest price which the act of parliament authorises.

The old navigators implore, that this capital regulation may be made under the auspices of parliament,

ment, and that this very extensive proposition will not be entrusted with interested proprietors, controuled only by commissioners, who may be *liable at least* to the assaults of *extraneous* and dangerous *solicitations*.

If the proprietors shall be pleased to assert, that it is not now practicable to ascertain the tolls which are to be collected, and that an equal tonnage cannot with justice be extended to all articles indiscriminately; permit us to answer; fix your equality, with as many exceptions as ought to be enumerated; but if you are not prepared to ascertain the tonnage; postpone; come again in another session; but you will not presume to put the expence of soliciting this bill in competition with the whole property of the two established navigations; and we ardently trust, that our ALL will not depend upon the decision of any other judicature than a *British* parliament.

The company of proprietors ought not to be formed into a company of navigators beyond a certain number. Intuition shews the necessity and utility of this provision. Proprietors of tolls, (by consolidating tonnage and freightage in one charge) might take an inferior tonnage upon goods navigated by themselves; and full tonnage upon all others; and would consequently monopolize the freightage of the whole canal; for *who* could carry goods upon equal terms with those who can make a considerable deduction in the lock dues?

The public must conceive very advantageous expectations of the utility of an inland navigation between *Hull* and *Liverpool*, when they are informed, that the freight of goods will necessarily amount to forty shillings per ton.

UPON THE WHOLE, it is hoped, that the consideration of this very important bill will be postponed:

F

Because

Because the very practicability of the scheme is doubtful.

Because the *whole* of the undertaking has been neither considered, nor disclosed at any public county meeting.

Because the country has been deceived, as to the real course of the canal; and it cannot be known, with precision, whose lands will be cut through.

Because the diversion proposed in favour of the duke of *Bridgewater* is irregular, unparliamentary, foreign to the nature and title of the bill, and may establish a precedent dangerous to property.

Because extending the canal either beyond *Burton* or *Northwich* is not founded in necessity, nor supported by considerations of public utility.

Because this extension is unjust, and will involve two effectual navigations, established *under the faith* of parliament, in certain and irreparable ruin.

Because this extension could only be desired for *private* views, or to make a *more lucrative* job for engineers.

Because an effectual communication between *Hull* and *Liverpool* may be completed, without this extension.

Because the confining of the canal between *Burton* and *Northwich* will not only considerably accelerate the communication between *Hull* and *Liverpool*, but will prevent an enormous expence, and preserve the old navigations from injury, and thirty miles of land from unnecessary mutilation.

Because if the canal stops at *Northwich*, a new, *cheap* and *expeditious* communication with *Manchester* will be opened, by a canal which is to be cut directly from *Witton* Bridge.

Because the Duke of *Bridgewater* might divert the termination of his own canal to the *Mersey* above, or to *Weaver* below, *Frodsham* bridge, and open
open

open *another* communication with the new canal and Manchester.

Because no actual survey has been made, nor correct plan taken, nor any fair estimate formed; nor can the undertakers themselves be aware of the expence which they may be liable to.

Because the course and termination of the canal being neither clearly known nor properly fixed, a power of varying five hundred yards may be attended with *fatal* consequences to individuals.

Because it would be dangerous to precipitate in this session, a bill of this magnitude, which has received no previous, local deliberations.

Because an eager solicitude for carrying this great and complicated bill, in all events in this session, must flow from a jealousy, that the scheme would be generally disapproved, and the subscribers revolt, if a public opportunity were given of examining and discussing the full and real tendency of it, with an attention and severity equal to its importance.

CASE in Behalf of the BILL for making a Navigable CUT or CANAL from the Trent to the Mersey.

IT is very unfortunate for the common interest of the public, that plans the most maturely digested, and framed on the most liberal and beneficial principles, are liable to be misrepresented by the attempts which private interest or personal jealousy raise in opposition to their progress.

The influence of such partial and invidious motives was never more apparent than in the endeavours which have been made to create undue prejudices

against the proposed canal from the *Trent* to the *Mersey*. A noble design, of which the benefit is not confined to a few towns, or even counties ; but which is calculated to improve the commerce and agriculture of the nation in general, as by diminishing the price of carriage, it will not only contribute to the better cultivation of our lands, but to render the necessaries of life more cheap, and to reduce the price of our manufactures, whereby in the end we shall acquire a permanent superiority over our foreign competitors.

But the more readily to attain these great objects, it is necessary that the trunk of the proposed canal should terminate at such points as will be most immediately advantageous to commerce, *and will most easily admit of a farther extension.*

With these views, the undertakers of the intended navigation have proposed that it should terminate at one end in a *free* part of the river *Trent*, and at the other end in a part of the *Mersey*, which is not liable to the interruption of *neap* or low tides ; by which means also, an easy communication may be opened with the great manufacturing town of *Manchester* and its neighbourhood ; and from whence the canal may be extended over the river into *Lancashire*, to the general benefit of the interior parts of that county, as well as of the port of *Liverpool*, and of all the towns and places through the whole extent of the navigation.

But though the advantages which will attend these terminations, are so obvious, yet some, influenced by partial regards, either overlook them, or, seeing them, would wilfully represent them to others in a false point of view, so as to beget an opinion that the intended canal would better terminate at *Northwich* and *Burton*.

The inexpedience however of such terminations,
and

and the public injury which would result from them, will be apparent to every unprejudiced mind, attentive to the following facts and observations.

It will be necessary to premise that by the bill in question, the intended navigation is proposed to unite with the canal in part made, and authorized to be farther continued, by the Duke of *Bridgewater*, at a place near *Preston-Brock*, whereby goods will in twelve hours be constantly and certainly conveyed from the part of the navigation opposite *Middlewich* to *Manchester*, without the interruption of a single lock, or any necessity of transshipping: and they will likewise be conveyed under the same advantages, from the part of the canal opposite to *Northwich*, in ten hours.

But should the canal, on the other hand, be made to terminate in the river *Weaver* at *Northwich*, there must be not less than *forty-nine feet* of locking between that place and *Middlewich*, which, computing *seven feet* to a lock, will require *seven locks*. Between *Northwich* and the *Mersey* likewise, there are *five locks* more, so that all the goods carried by this conveyance to *Manchester* and the neighbouring places must descend not less than *seventy-five feet* to get into the *Mersey*, and must then be mounted up an equal ascent, to come into the Duke's canal. Not to mention, that all goods must be transhipped, and that the vessels must be liable to infinite delays upon the river navigation by floods and locks, as well as by waiting for tides, and by meeting with contrary winds and stormy weather, which they will be entirely free from upon the canal.

The difference likewise in point of distance between the two modes of conveyance is *fourteen miles* in favour of that proposed by the bill: and with respect to the price of carriage, it scarce exceeds half the rate to which the other will amount. To this

may be added, that if the canal should terminate at *Northwich*, the communication between the interior parts of the kingdom and the port of *Liverpool*, would not, in any degree, be so compleat, as if it was to terminate at *Runcorn*, as the conveyance from thence would be more certain, and at the same time more cheap and expeditious than from *Northwich*.

As it is evident, from the above state of facts, that it would be highly injurious to the public interest, if the intended canal should terminate at *Northwich*; so it will, in like manner, be apparent, that it would be equally detrimental, if the other end was to terminate at *Burton*.

With respect to this part of the case, it is necessary to observe, that the river *Trent* is navigable by nature from *Gainsborough* to *Wilden*; and by an act of the 10th and 11th *William* the Third, the Lord *Paget* and his heirs were impowered to make it navigable from *Wilden* to *Burton*. This navigation is yet far from being compleated: and as by a clause in the act, all persons are restrained from building wharfs or warehouses on the sides of the river, without the consent of the noble undertaker and the commissioners; this circumstance, together with the management of the lessees, has, as will be proved, rendered this navigation a compleat *monopoly*. Beside, if the canal should terminate at *Burton*, as the mills and the forge below the town are in the possession of the lessees of that navigation, it would be in their power, by drawing off the water, to lay the boats aground between the warehouses and the mills, and thereby distress the vessels, and interrupt the commerce upon that part of the river.

Add to this, that there are many shallows between *Burton* and *Wilden*, which in dry seasons are not navigable, but by means of flashes of water let off
from

from the mills, and by withholding this water, the lessees may, as they frequently have, impede the navigation below *Burton Lock*, and render it totally dependent upon their pleasure. So that if the canal was to terminate at *Burton*, all the goods going upwards must be liable to these inconveniencies, or be sent by land-carriage for *ten* or *fifteen* miles, when they might, for the same expence, be conveyed half the length of the canal. And though it may be said, that there are shallows below *Wilden*, yet they are not so inconvenient, and have additional supplies of water; but surely it must be admitted to be of great advantage, to adopt that plan which is not attended with half the difficulties of the other. Not to mention, that by the canal there will be a saving of *five* miles in the distance from *Burton* to *Wilden*.

With respect to the low rate of tonnage, which is urged as an argument against extending the canal to *Wilden*, though it is true, that the lessees are not impowered to take more than *three pence*, by way of *tonnage*; yet, under the name of *wharfage*, they actually take *eight times* that sum. But it will appear, from a fair calculation, ready to be produced, that by continuing the canal from *Burton* to *Wilden*, there will be a saving in carriage of more than *four shillings per ton* between those places, besides the advantages to trade from the greater certainty and expedition in the conveyance.

It may not be immaterial to observe, that the promoters of the bill, have conducted it upon such fair and liberal principles, as their opponents have rather chosen to misrepresent, than to imitate. They trust, however, that they shall be able to refute, by evidence before the house, the several groundless objections and injurious insinuations, which have been industriously propagated by the parties interested, and by nameless writers; some of whom have, with un-

exampled temerity, even ventured to misstate and arraign the proceedings of parliament, in a matter then depending before the house. The promoters of the bill being anxious to establish it upon a plan most conducive to the general good, and to avoid doing any detriment to individuals, did most cheerfully, as far as in them lay, adopt various clauses for securing the property of several land-owners. They cannot forbear observing likewise, that the commissioners and proprietors of the navigations of the *Weaver* and the *Trent* at *Burton*, and their agents, had copies of the bill long before it went to a committee, and that they constantly attended its progress, though they did not think proper to petition till the committee was closed: from whence it is apparent, that they do not want to have any compensation or redress for any losses or injuries to which they may be liable, but would endeavour entirely to defeat the bill, in order that they may continue their unreasonable exactions upon the public without any check or controul.

Upon the whole, it is submitted to the judgment of the candid and unprejudiced, whether under the circumstances above stated, it will not be highly injurious to the public, to fix the termination of a canal of such great length and general importance, in a part of a river which is a *monopoly*, and a very great grievance to the country; as it must moreover be attended with great and frequent delays, difficulties and losses; all which may be avoided, by making the termination in a part of the same river which is *free*.

FACTS

FACTS and REASONS *tending to shew, that the proposed Canal, from the Trent to the Mersey, ought not to terminate at Northwich and Burton; and to prove, that this Plan hath been well digested, and hath not wanted public Notoriety.*

THAT the good of a part must always give way to the good of the whole, when they happen to interfere, is one of the most essential principles of civil association: but it is at all times reasonable, that the great interests of the community should be pursued and supported, with as little injury as possible to individuals.

In the course of human affairs, and during the gradual improvement of the arts of life, small things are constantly yielding to greater, bad to good, and good to better, in proportion as human genius expands, and enriches the world with its discoveries; and it is the unavoidable effect of every new improvement, in sciences or in arts, to diminish the value of less perfect systems, and works of inferior utility.

But it is a circumstance which gives much pleasure to the friends and promoters of the bill for a canal from the *Trent* to the *Mersey*, that very few individuals will suffer by the execution of this great design. And when a work of such extensive utility is under consideration, it is certainly desirable to have it executed in such a manner as to render it as compleat as the nature of the thing will admit.

The object of this design is not local; it is not confined to a few towns or counties. A great and general diminution of the price of carriage, between the inland counties and sea-ports, will contribute most effectually to increase the *cultivation of our lands*, to reduce the *price of our manufactures*, and to
give

give us a *superiority* over our most formidable competitors, at *foreign markets*.

And when the *branches* already intended, and others that may be useful and practicable, are joined to this great canal, the trade of a considerable part of the kingdom will receive the advantage of this new conveyance. It is therefore to be wished, that the TRUNK may be terminated, so as to facilitate commerce in the *best manner*, and the most easily to admit of *further extension*. For these purposes the undertakers of the intended navigation are desirous that it may be terminated in a *free* part of the river *Trent* at one end, and carried to a part of the *Mersey* at the other, which is not liable to the interruption of *neap tides*; by which means a communication may also be opened with the great manufacturing town of *Manchester* and its neighbourhood, and from whence the canal may be extended over the river into *Lancashire*, to the *general benefit of the interior parts of that county*, as well as the port of *Liverpool*, and of all the towns and places through the whole extent of the navigation.

That it would be a very great limitation of its utility, and consequently a *public injury*, to *mutilate* this GREAT CANAL, by terminating it at *Burton* and *Northwich*, we presume will appear, to every impartial person, from the following facts and considerations.

By means of the junction of the *great trunk* with the Duke of *Bridgewater's* canal near *Preston Brooke*; merchandize will be conveyed from that part of the navigation near *Middlewich*, to *Manchester*, without the interruption of a single lock, or the expence, damage and delays, occasioned by *transshipping*, uniformly and certainly, in *twelve* hours: And from that part of the canal opposite to *Northwich*, in about *ten* hours. But if this canal should terminate
in

in the river *Weaver* at *Northwich*, there must be 49 feet of locking between *Middlewich* and that place; which, at seven feet to a lock, will require seven locks; and between *Northwich* and the *Mersey* there are five more; so that all the goods going *this way* to *Manchester*, and its neighbourhood, must be carried down a sort of navigable steps *seventy-five feet*, to descend into the *Mersey*; and then to be mounted up another series of steps, 79 feet high, to come into the Duke of *Bridgewater's* canal.

It is also necessary to observe, that all the goods must be *transhipped* at *Northwich*, which generally occasions a considerable delay, as well as damage; and that the vessels must wait for a *sufficient tide* to carry them into the *Mersey*; and when they get thither, they must lie at anchor, till another tide enables them to turn the point of land, and get up to *Runcorn Gap*. This will be the quickest passage they can make: But they may meet with contrary winds, or stormy weather, that may retard their passage *many days*.

It is also very material to observe the different lengths of these two roads from *Northwich* to *Manchester*. By the two rivers, and the Duke's canal, the distance is 48 miles, by the canals 32 miles; the difference 16 miles.

Another very material circumstance, attending carriage, is the price of it. As the *time* and *risque* in going from *Northwich* to *Runcorn*, by the two rivers, will always be as much, and often more, than in going to *Liverpool*, the price will at least be equal. The comparative expence of taking goods off the canal at *Northwich*, and sending them down the *Weaver*, into the *Mersey*, and up the Duke of *Bridgewater's* canal to *Manchester*; and of conveying them from the *same place*, upon a *level*, through the

the *two canals* to that great manufacturing town, will therefore stand as follows :

	£.	s.	d.
Tonnage and freight, from <i>Northwich</i> to <i>Liverpool</i> , is 5s. 3d. per ton;			
Suppose the same to <i>Runcorn</i> —	0	5	3
Wharfage, trans-shipping, &c. suppose	0	0	9
Freight and tonnage on the Duke's canal, to <i>Manchester</i> , —	0	4	0
	0	10	0

	£.	s.	d.
From <i>Northwich</i> to the point of junction with the Duke's canal at <i>Preston-Brooke</i> , being 8 miles, —	0	1	0
From thence to <i>Manchester</i> , —	0	2	6
Freight 32 miles, being no lock, —	0	1	8
	0	5	2
Saving 4s. and 10d. per ton,			

But suppose the expence upon this comparison, should have turned out just contrary; the risque and delay of this *round about* conveyance, would most certainly prevent the *Manchester* goods from ever being sent this way; and indeed, to all who know the circumstances, the proposal must appear too ridiculous to merit a serious confutation.

Another way has been proposed to defeat the intended union with the Duke of *Bridgewater's* canal. It has been said that the *Manchester* goods may be conveyed to and from the same points, by the *Cheshire* canals, without this union. The *agents* of the Bill for the *great canal* have constantly avoided interfering in any thing relative to the *Cheshire* canals :

nals : But since attempts are made to prevent the Public from having a *much better* conveyance to *Manchester*, they are obliged to desire that the following particulars may be properly attended to.

By means of the junction, goods may be conveyed from near *Northwich* to *Manchester*, upon a *level*, as has been observed before, in about ten hours ; and his Grace's canal is *actually making*, and will soon be finished. Whether the other canals will ever be made is very uncertain, though they should receive the sanction of the legislature ; as it is the opinion of able and experienced engineers, that they will not cost less than the enormous sum of 70,000*l.* and that it is very doubtful whether all the tonnage that can reasonably be expected to come upon them, will raise so much money as will be necessary to keep the numerous locks in repair : And if the subscribers should, upon reflection, think this may possibly be near the *truth of the case*, it is hardly probable they will choose to risque so *hazardous an experiment*.

But suppose these *canals* actually made ; the lockage *up* from *Northwich* to *Mottram* will be no less than 235 feet, and down from *Mottram* to the *level* of *Manchester*, 138 feet ; which, at 7 feet to a lock, will require above 50 locks ; and the delay that this circumstance must occasion, will unavoidably be so very considerable, as to render the other way much more *expeditious*, and *beneficial to the Public*.

It is also worthy of observation, that if the canal should terminate at *Northwich*, the communication between the *interior parts of the kingdom*, and the *port of Liverpool*, would not be near *so compleat* as if it was to terminate at *Runcorn* ; as the conveyance by this last place, would at the same time be *cheaper* and more *expeditious*.

If

If goods are taken off the canal at *Northwich*, to be sent down the *Weaver*, they will be liable to be retarded, in the first place, at *Pickering's* lock, about four miles above *Frodsham Bridge*, where there is a shallow by which vessels are detained, sometimes five, six, or seven days, for want of water. The spring-tides only flow here about *an hour and a half* each tide, and it is only during that space (except in land-floods) that a boat can pass this shallow. There is likewise, above *Frodsham Bridge*, a *bar* that runs across the river, which, during low neaps, is impassable for three or four days. There are likewise several *other shallows* in this river. These *delays* and *inconveniencies* render this navigation *ineffectual* for the conveyance of the produce even of the *county of Chester*; as far the *most considerable part* of the CHEESE produced in that county, is now carried *by land, parallel* with the *whole length* of this EXCELLENT navigation, to *Frodsham Bridge* and *Bank Quay*; from which places it is conveyed by flats, to *Liverpool*, there to be re-shipped for *London* and other *markets*;—and SALT, the other *staple article* of this county, is sent in *great quantities*, all by land-carriage, from *Northwich* to *Manchester*, for the supply of that town, and a very extensive and populous neighbourhood, notwithstanding the present *navigable communication* between those places. *Facts*, that prove to a *demonstration*, how *ineffectual* the present *navigations* are for the commerce of the country they pass through: and how much the counties of *Lancashire* and *Cheshire*, in particular, are interested in having a *better conveyance*. And, by the immense quantities of earth, brought down by the artificial river navigations (which are perpetually robbing the land-owners of considerable parts of their estates) the *depth* of water in the rivers is *constantly diminishing*;

10

so that these interruptions will be continually growing worse.

And this way will not only be more liable to delays, but also more expensive than by *Runcorn*, as will appear from the following comparison :

	£.	s.	d.
The freight and tonnage of <i>salt</i> and other merchandize from <i>Northwich</i> to <i>Liverpool</i> , by the present navigation, amount to 5 <i>s.</i> 3 <i>d.</i> per ton	—	0	5 3
The freight and tonnage from <i>Northwich</i> to <i>Runcorn-Gap</i> , by the intended canal, will amount to no more than two shillings per ton,	—	0	2 0
And from thence to <i>Liverpool</i> ,	—	0	1 6
			0 3 6
Saving per ton by the canal,	—	0	1 9

And why should the merchandize, upon this *great canal*, be subject to go by a *dear* and a *bad way*, when it may as well go by a *cheaper* and a *better*? This would be sacrificing the *public interest* to a *small concern*, by which no person can suffer; as the *salt* from *Winsford* and *Northwich* will continue to go down the *Weaver*, to avoid transshipping:—As this article alone will pay the interest of the debt;—and as a considerable part of the debt, upon that navigation, may be paid off, if the trustees think proper, before the great trunk can be finished.

Let it also be *well observed*; for it is a circumstance of *great importance*, that the water at *Runcorn* is about five feet *higher* than at *Pickering's* lock;

lock; and that such vessels as will be used in this trade, will not be liable to be interrupted there by *neap tides*.

Facts, which independant of the *great object* of going by a canal all the way to *Liverpool*, are, we presume, sufficient to convince every impartial person, that it would be much against the *public interest* to terminate the canal at *Northwich*.

And it is presumed the following important *facts* will also shew, that the other end of it ought not to terminate at *Burton*.

The river *Trent* is navigable by nature, from *Gainsborough* to *Wilden*; and by an act passed in the 10th and 11th of *William III.* the Lord *Paget* and his heirs, were empowered to make it navigable from *Wilden* to *Burton*; for which they were to receive a duty of 3*d.* per ton, on all the vessels that should navigate upon that part of the river.

In pursuance of this act, the river has not yet been pounded up *one inch higher* than it was before: And consequently the navigation hath not been *essentially improved*. Passages have only been opened through two mill weirs, by means of two locks; which have frequently been made use of, not to *facilitate*, but to *obstruct* the navigation; and as by a clause in this act, all persons are restrained from building *wharfs* or *warehouses* on the sides of the river, without the consent of the *noble undertaker*, and the commissioners; this circumstance, under the management of the lessees, hath rendered the navigation a compleat *monopoly*.

The distance from *Burton* to *Wilden*, by the river, is about 20 miles, and from *Burton* to *Wilden*, by the intended canal, only 15 miles.

If the canal should terminate at *Burton*, as the *mills* and *forge* below the town are in possession of the present lessees of that navigation, it would be in
their

their power, by drawing off the water, to lay the boats aground, between the *warehouses* and the *mills*, and thereby to distress the vessels, and to *interrupt all the commerce* that might depend upon that part of the river.

There are upwards of twenty *shallows* between *Burton* and *Wilden*, which are not navigable, except when there are freshes in the river, but by means of *flushes* of water, let off from the mills: And by *withholding* this water, the lessees may, and have frequently interrupted the navigation below *Burton Lock*; so that the navigation of this part of the *Trent* depends *entirely upon their pleasure*.

In the *Weir* at *Kings-Mills* there are a number of *floodgates*, one of which is very large, and was made by the former lessee, on purpose to draw the water off suddenly: And, by means of these gates, the water may likewise be with-held or let off by the OCCUPIER * of those mills, so as *totally to interrupt the navigation*.

In the year 1749, the *lessees* took an opportunity, when all the boats belonging to a certain company, which they wanted to distress, were below this *Weir*, to *sink a boat, laden with stones, in the lock*, and this answered *their purpose*, though it was a great *injury to the Public*: For all the goods that went down the navigation, during the space of 8 years and 8 months, were, by the continuance of this obstacle, under a necessity of being taken out of the boats above the lock; and were then carried, or rather *rolled and tumbled* into other vessels below; by which means many goods received great injury, and much earthen-ware, especially, was sent to foreign

* A lease of these mills has been lately granted to Mr. *Samuel Garbett* of *Birmingham*; whereby *that gentleman* will have the KEY of this navigation.

markets *broken and destroyed*, under all the *expences* of whole and perfect merchandise.

If the *canal* terminates at *Wilden*, the *manufactures*, *malt*, and other *produce* of those parts of *Leicestershire*, *Derbyshire* and *Nottinghamshire*, that lie near to the termination, may be conveyed by *water* from *Wilden* to the port of *Liverpool*, and several of the northern counties, and *entirely escape* the shallows, and other inconveniencies of the *Burton* navigation: But if the canal was to terminate at *Burton*, all the goods going *upwards* from the above-mentioned *district*, must either be liable to the inconveniencies of that navigation, or subject to the expence of land-carriage for 10 or 15 miles; which expence would convey them half the way to *Liverpool*.

In answer to the objection, that *there are several shallows in the Burton navigation*, it has been replied, that *there are likewise shallows below Wilden*; by which reply it is insinuated, that if we have twenty difficulties to overcome, and cannot obviate them all, there is no advantage in avoiding one half of them:—An insinuation that might have some little weight, if boats could not frequently pass over the shallows *below Wilden*, by means of the additional water and freshes of the *Derwent* and the *Soar*, when the shallows above *Wilden* are impassable.

The low tonnage on the *Burton* navigation, is also produced as an argument against extending the canal to *Wilden*; but though the lessees are not empowered to take more than 3 *d.* under the name of *tonnage*, yet they find means to take *eight times* that sum, on the goods carried by others, under the name of *wharfage*.

And if it should likewise appear, beside the expedition and uniform dispatch of a canal navigation, that goods may be conveyed to *Gainsborough*, from that part of the *canal* oppose to *Burton*, much cheaper

cheaper than they are *now* carried by the *river*, then it is presumed the advantage of extending the *canal* to *Wilden* will not admit of the least hesitation. And surely this is a plan of too much *national consequence* to be *abridged*, or *injuriously limited*, for the sake of *those* to whom the Public is not so much indebted for their *past services*, as to lie under an obligation to indulge them in their present *generous attempt* to prevent any body else from *serving it better*.

	£.	s.	d.
On the best authority, it is asserted, that the present average price of carriage by the river from <i>Burton</i> to <i>Gainsborough</i> is 12 s. per ton,	--	0	12 0
From <i>Wilden</i> to <i>Gainsborough</i> , about 90 miles, any quantity of goods will be conveyed at 5 s. per ton,	—	0	5 0
Therefore from <i>Burton</i> to <i>Wilden</i> , about 19 and $\frac{1}{2}$ miles, the expence is 7 s. per ton,	- - - -	0	7 0
By the canal from <i>Burton</i> to <i>Wilden</i> , being about 15 miles, the tonnage and wharfage for that distance, at $1\frac{1}{2}$ d. a mile, amount to	—	0	1 10 $\frac{1}{2}$
Freight, at the rate of 6 d. per ton for 10 miles,	- - - -	0	0 9
	—————	0	2 7 $\frac{1}{2}$
Saving to the Public, by extending the canal to <i>Wilden</i> , 4 s. and $4\frac{1}{2}$ d. per ton,		0	4 4 $\frac{1}{2}$

It is therefore humbly submitted to the *legislature*, all these circumstances being considered, whether it would not be a very great *injury to the Public* to fix the end of a canal of such length and *immense importance*, as that from the *Trent* to the *Mersey*, in

so *bad* a part of a river which is a *monopoly*, when it may, *so much more advantageously*, terminate in a *better* part of that river which is *free*?

And as an attempt has been made to defeat this *noble undertaking* by *insinuations* that it has not been sufficiently *digested*, that it wants the requisite *notoriety*; and by a notorious *falsehood*, boldly asserted in print, that “a meeting at *Wolsley Bridge*, held “the 30th of *December* last, was the *only* one which “preceded the application to parliament,” it will be requisite for the information of those gentlemen, who may not be acquainted with the subject, to put down a few *plain facts*, whereby they may judge what credit ought to be given to *publications*, that contain such *glaring falsehoods*.

A *survey* of the greatest part of this design was taken, at the expence of the Corporation of *Liverpool*, in the year 1755; and a plan of this survey was engraved.

Another *survey* was made in 1758, and paid for by a subscription in *Staffordshire*.

In the same year a pamphlet on this subject was published in *London*, and dispersed in those parts of the country that were most likely to be affected by the execution of the plan: and many towns were made acquainted with it by personal applications.

In 1760, a public meeting was advertised, and held at *Sandon* in *Staffordshire*, where Lord *Gower*, Mr. *Anson*, and the gentlemen of the neighbouring counties attended, to consider of the measures to be taken for carrying the plan into execution; and some difficulties arising, at that time, the gentlemen desired farther surveys might be made, and that they might be extended from *Tide-way* to *Tide-way*: and near 1000*l.* was immediately subscribed for that purpose.

The

The next public meeting, by advertisement, was held the same year at *Wolsey-Bridge*, when another survey made by Mr. *Smeaton* and Mr. *Brindley*, of that part of the intended canal between *Wilden* and *Harecastle*, was ordered to be engraved, the other surveys not being compleated; and copies of these plans were delivered to the land-owners, and neighbouring gentlemen.

By these means, this *design* was already very generally made known, and expected to be carried into execution, as will particularly appear by the following fact.

About this time, the former lease of the *Burton* navigation being expired, the *lessee* applied to the noble proprietor for a renewal of it, for which he demanded a sum not much short of 4000*l.* The lessee offered 3000*l.* on condition, that if the *intended canal* should be made in *ten* years, 1000*l.* of the money should be returned. But the noble proprietor rather chose to have a smaller fine certainly fixed; than to have any trouble about such contingencies: and as the lessee did not comply with this proposal, his Lordship did actually grant a lease of the navigation to a new company, for a *certain* fine of 2500*l.* rather than be liable to the trouble of future applications and deductions, on account of any *interfering extension*: so that the lessees may truly be said to have received a compensation already.

After more than *ten* years deliberation upon this subject, it was determined to make a vigorous attempt to carry the plan into execution: and some late *exactions* upon the *Burton* navigation, added to the *delays* and *inconveniencies* attending that of the *Weaver*, contributed not a little towards raising a proper spirit in the country, for this purpose.

A meeting was therefore called, on the 20th of *March*, 1765, and a subscription begun towards the

expence of the Act; and it was ordered, that personal application should be made to the gentlemen of *Ckeshire, Liverpool, Birmingham, Lichfield*, and other places, to inform them of this intention, and to desire their concurrence and assistance; which was accordingly done. The Commissioners of the *Weaver navigation* were waited upon at their public meeting in *Northwich*, on the 4th of *May* following, and informed that it was intended to cut past that navigation; the reasons for which were produced to them in writing; and a plan of the *canal*, so far as it could then be ascertained: and they would much sooner have had the satisfaction they now complain for the want of, if the surveyors had not been stopped, by one of the commissioners, and *absolutely refused* the liberty of proceeding with their survey.

The 13th of *May* a public meeting, by advertisement, was held at *Newcastle* in *Staffordshire*, when further surveys were ordered to be made, and other necessary business to be done; and the commissioners of the *Weaver navigation* sent their treasurer, and clerk of the navigation, to attend this meeting.

The next meeting was advertised for the 27th of *June* following, at the same place. At this meeting the plan was agreed upon; the heads of the bill produced, read over and approved; and near 20,000*l.* subscribed, or promised to be advanced; and the result of this meeting was inserted in the public papers.

Another pamphlet* was then published, upon this subject, of which above 1000 copies were sold and

* *A View of the Advantages of Inland Navigations*, printed for *Becket and De Hondt* in the Strand; and *Johnson and Davenport* in *Pater-noster-Row*; to which pamphlet we beg leave to refer for ample proofs of the utility of inland navigations in general, and particularly of the intended canal from the *Trent* to the *Mersey*.

distributed: and in this *pamphlet* the intended junction with the duke of *Bridgewater's* navigation was expressly mentioned.

The last general meeting on this occasion, was on the 30th of *December* at *Wolsey-Bridge*, when the former steps were confirmed; and it was again unanimously agreed to petition for a *canal* from the *Trent* at *Wilden*, to the river *Mersey*.

It is not, therefore, for want of *notoriety*, or because this *scheme* has not been *sufficiently digested*, that it meets with *opposition*; but because it has been *too well digested*, and offers the public more *advantages* than some interested individuals could wish; and who would have been much better satisfied, if the plan had been *more defective*.

Upon an *impartial* and *comprehensive view* of the CASE, respecting the intended *canal* from the *Trent* to the *Mersey*, the friends of that undertaking hope it will appear——that the great *outlines* of this design were drawn above ten years ago; that the plan hath since received many improvements; that the *preference* given to the terminations fixed by the bill, as it now stands, is supported by the clearest reasons of *public utility*: that the execution of this plan will be a *great* and *permanent* benefit to the *agriculture* and *commerce* of this kingdom; that it will reduce the price of carriage above *six shillings* in *eight*; and thereby enable us to meet our *commercial competitors* at *foreign markets* upon *much better terms* than we can at present. That it will greatly preserve the *public roads*; and lessen the expence of keeping them in repair. That it will *most essentially* advance the *wealth* and *strength* of this nation; by increasing the *quantity* of our *home products*, and of our *exports*; and, by finding employment for greater numbers of *vessels* and *seamen*: that it will diffuse a spirit of navigation through the very heart of the

kingdom; and by bringing many boys and youths, from the inland counties, within the *influence* of *sea-port towns*, greatly *enlarge* the *field* for the production of sailors:—That it will find *immediate* and *constant* employment for vast numbers of people:—And lastly, that it will have a tendency to prevent *injurious monopolies* of the *necessaries of life*; by opening so extensive and cheap a communication between the *interior parts of the kingdom*, and *manufacturing towns and sea-ports*: for the “attempts of the most
 “powerful *monopolizer* must certainly be *ineffectual*,
 “in a country where plenty can be thrown into any
 “market, from all parts, by means of *navigable*
 “*canals*.”

SUPPLEMENT to a Pamphlet, entitled, ‘Season-
 ‘able CONSIDERATIONS on a NAVIGABLE
 ‘CANAL intended to be cut from the River TRENT,
 ‘at Wilden Ferry, in the County of DERBY, to the
 ‘River MERSEY, in the County of CHESTER.’

TWO wretched pieces, the one entitled, “Case
 “in Behalf of the Bill for making a navigable Cut
 “or Canal from the Trent to the Mersey;” and the
 other, “FACTS and REASONS tending to shew, that
 “the proposed Canal from the Trent to the Mersey
 “ought not to terminate at Northwich and Burton;
 “and to prove, that this Plan hath been well di-
 “gested, and hath not wanted public Notoriety,”
 having been cautiously circulated, the true friends of
 the scheme for “opening a Communication between
 “Hull and Liverpool” cheerfully embrace a second
 opportunity of exposing to public view the flimsy
 pretexts, under which the enemies of justice are
 driven to shelter themselves.

A few

A few hours only being allowed for these remarks, we hope, that we shall not be denied a degree of candour and indulgence, if fifteen *heavy* and *laboured* pages, and a sheet of three *full* pages more, are not examined with that minute precision, which is always to be desired in matters of importance.

In the course of the “Seasonable Considerations,” which these pieces were intended to answer, various arguments were offered in order to prove, “that *public utility* does not require that the proposed canal should be extended beyond either *Burton* or *Northwich*.”

It is not disputed, that *private views* exist, which make this extension eligible.

Now we shall consider the manner, in which the propriety of their extension is supported by these matchless projectors.

The first ground is “that goods may go to *Manchester* with more ease, by the *Trent* canal communicating with the Duke of *Bridgewater*’s canal at *Preston-Brook*, than by terminating at the river *Weaver* at *Northwich*; as there will be no lock to go through, and all inconveniencies from transshipping avoided.” But what is this ridiculous argument to the carriage of goods to *Liverpool*, which was the true object of this bill? Did the gentlemen, convened at *Wolsley-Bridge*, on the 30th of *December*, 1765, ever dream either of a communication with *Manchester*, or any junction with his Grace?

It can be demonstrated, that “whenever vessels can work to the *Hempstones* or *Runcorn-Gap*,” they may go to *Frodsham-Bridge* and *Northwich*; and let it be observed, that an effectual communication between *Hull* and *Liverpool*, is the scheme now to be discussed; the opening an intercourse with other places may be the subject of future consideration;

tion ; but cannot form the merits of this bill. Let this proposition be kept distinct ; and it will be clearly understood.

There is a manifest fallacy in a “ calculation from “ *Northwich* to *Manchester*, by means of the two “ rivers and the Duke’s canal, compared with his “ Grace’s communication with the *Trent* canal at “ *Preston-Brook*,” by which these gentlemen are ingenious enough to deduce a “ saving of four shillings and ten pence *per ton*.” But as this is also a consideration entirely foreign to the immediate subject of a communication between *Hull* and *Liverpool*, we cannot, with propriety, enter into an examination of it ; though it is certain, that there would not be a *saving* to the public of *six pence per ton*.

These gentlemen in order to illustrate their pretensions make the following calculation ;

	£.	s.	d.
“ The freight and tonnage of <i>salt</i> and			
“ other merchandize from <i>North-</i>			
“ <i>wich</i> to <i>Liverpool</i> , by the present			
“ navigation, amounts to	—	0	5 3
“ The freight and tonnage from <i>North-</i>			
“ <i>wich</i> to <i>Runcorn-Gap</i> , by the in-			
“ tended canal, will amount to			
“ no more than two shillings <i>per</i>			
“ ton	—	0	2 0
“ And from thence to <i>Li-</i>			
“ <i>verpool</i>	—	0	1 6
		—	0 3 6
“ Saving <i>per ton</i> by the canal	—	0	1 9

Let

Let a fair and just calculation be contrasted with the above:

By the canal; Tonnage from <i>Witton-Bridge</i> to <i>Runcorn</i> , being fifteen miles,	<i>l.</i>	<i>s.</i>	<i>d.</i>
10. at $1\frac{1}{2}d.$ and 5 at $1d.$ is —	0	1	8
Freightage at one penny per mile for fifteen miles, is —	0	1	3
Wharfage and transshipping at <i>Runcorn</i> , —	0	0	9
Freight from thence to <i>Liverpool</i> —	0	2	0
	0	5	8

By the river; the tonnage and freightage from *Northwich* to *Liverpool* do not upon an average exceed —

	0	4	0
	0	1	8

So that here is a *true* saving by the river of one shilling and eight pence per ton.

Confining these remarks to the opening of a communication between *Hull* and *Liverpool*, we shall purposely avoid entering into the merits of the new canal, which the *Cheshire* gentlemen wish to cut from “*Witton-Bridge* to *Knutsford*, *Macclesfield*, “*Stockport* and *Manchester* ;” that scheme needs no other support than what its intrinsic and undoubted utility loudly claims; we know its fair prospect must create a jealousy in the minds of the most potent patrons of this bill. We shall upon the same principle dismiss every consideration of a communication with *Manchester* by the Duke’s canal (*which is to be finished, God knows when*) as foreign to the question before us; but though the agents and engineers think it convenient to controvert the practicability, and

and aggravate the expence of all undertakings but their own, we venture to suggest, in favour of the *Cheshire* canal, that a *saving of thirty per cent. in the article of tonnage* will make ample amends for a trivial delay in passing through a few locks.

Goods “from *Northwich*, are not liable to be re-
“tarded at *Pickering’s* lock above *Frodsham-Bridge*,”
nor are “vessels detained there,” but very rarely
“for want of water;” nor is there “above *Frod-*
“*sham-Bridge* any bar that runs across the river,
“which, during low neaps, is impassable for three
“or four days;” all this is grossly misrepresented.
“A considerable part of the *cheese* is” indeed “car-
“ried by land, parallel with the whole length of this
“excellent navigation, to *Frodsham-Bridge* and *Bank*
“*Quay*; from whence it is conveyed to *Liverpool*,
“there to be re-shipped for *London* and other mar-
“kets,” because those places are the center for the
delivery of cheese, and there are large warehouses
there.

These gentlemen observe, “that if the canal should
“terminate at *Northwich*, the communication be-
“tween the interior parts of the kingdom and *Li-*
“*verpool* would not be so complete, as if it was to
“terminate at *Runcorn-Gap*.” This is a bold as-
sertion; and an incomprehensible one into the bar-
gain.

“The river *Trent*” [these projectors alledge]
“has not since the act of the 10th and 11th of *Wil-*
“*liam III.* been yet pounded up one inch higher,
“than it was before:” but it does not follow, that
“the navigation hath not been *essentially improved*;
for “by means of two locks in the mill weirs” a
better navigation was made than could be had be-
low *Wilden*; and making two feet of water there at
all times, would have answered no purpose, unless it
could be had in all parts below *Wilden*.

As

As to “drawing off the water at *Burton Mills*,” is it natural to imagine, that any body of men will wantonly throw away the water, when the want of it must necessarily distress a large set of their own corn and flour mills, with an iron forge and fulling mills, depending upon detached and different interests?

There need not be any apprehension entertained of the present lessees of the navigation “interrupting commerce, by drawing off the water of the river from *King’s Mills*, which they are in possession of, below *Burton* ;” for their lease is just out ; and “*this key of the navigation*” has been privately taken from them ; and it is more than *suspected*, that it has, *by some means or other*, got into the hands of the company of proprietors ; but the projectors are under a delusion, if they are *serious* in thinking, that *King’s Mills* are the key of the navigation ; the business of which may be completely executed without them.

There are “fewer *shallows* between *Burton* and *Wilden* than between *Wilden* and *Gainsborough* ;” and those shallows are for forty miles frequently assisted by flashes from the lower mills, upon the *Trent* and the *Derwent* ;” and the present lessees have never withheld flashes of water from any boat.

The present lessees have not been engaged in this navigation more than three years ; and consequently are not answerable “for the misconduct of their predecessors in 1749,” or in any other period. They have never fraudulently *destroyed*, *altered* or *mangled* their customers directions, or been guilty of any paltry or iniquitous practices ; but have acted with universal *propriety* ; of which they can produce the best testimonials.

It is no less their duty than their inclination, to lay before the public, in due time, the *true* sources of
of

of complaints which have *formerly* obtained against this navigation.—Let public indignation alight where it ought: they are anxious to meet every charge of insolence or exaction: armed with conscious integrity, they appeal with confidence to the just tribunal of a *British* parliament.

The present lessees have been the instrument of “restoring the lock,” which their predecessors had destroyed; they have enlarged their wharfs and warehouses; encreased the number of their boats; and are in a condition to serve the public effectually; and it is upon these principles, that they are bold to consider themselves as intitled *in return* to public protection. To this, they desire to add, that in consequence of a public advertisement from the noble proprietor (who had justly conceived not only himself but the public egregiously abused by his former tenants) they treated for a lease for three lives; for which they paid his lordship a fine of 2500*l.*; and an additional sum of 4000*l.* to the former lessees for their interest in certain wharfs, &c.—and are besides liable to considerable rents; they have also employed a capital of 4000*l.* more in purchasing and making wharfs and boats; hence may be collected the injuries which they must suffer, if this canal is extended below *Burton*.

They cannot expect a compensation of any kind, unless the wisdom and justice of the legislature shall dictate it.

The present lessees have never taken more than *twelve pence* per ton “for wharfage,” keeping accounts and collecting freight; which is the same as the wharfingers charge at *Gainsborough*; and there have been some hundred tons landed without any premium.

By

	£.	s.	d.
By the river, the present average price of carriage from <i>Burton</i> to <i>Gainsborough</i> , is, per ton, — —	0	10	0
From <i>Wilden</i> to <i>Gainsborough</i> , where the navigation is allowed to be free, the average price is — —	0	8	0
Therefore from <i>Burton</i> to <i>Wilden</i> , about 19 miles, the expence is per ton —	0	2	0

By the canal from <i>Burton</i> to <i>Wilden</i> , being 16 miles, the tonnage may amount to — —	0	2	0
Freight, upon an average, cannot be less than 1d. per mile — —	0	1	4
	0	3	4
“ Saving to the public,” by stopping the canal at <i>Burton</i> , “ per ton” —	0	1	4

“ It is therefore humbly submitted to the legislature, Whether it would not be a very great injury to the public,” as well as an unnecessary violation of private property, to suffer “ a canal of such length and immense importance” to run nearly parallel for thirty miles, with two good navigations; and to endanger a capital of forty thousand pounds: “ when it might so much more advantageously terminate” at *Burton* and *Northwich*; relieve the undertakers, already unmercifully loaded; preserve from depredation a fund from the *Weaver* navigation, which is sacred to public uses; secure thirty miles of land from grievous mutilation; and promote every consideration of *real public utility*.

Great

Great pains are used in the pieces which are under consideration to induce a belief; “that the plan has “not wanted public notoriety;—” that “a survey “was taken in 1755;” “another in 1758, and a “pamphlet published;”—“a public meeting in “1760, at *Sandon in Staffordshire*;”—“other meetings in *March, May, and June, 1765*;”—“at “the last of which, the heads of a bill were produced;”—now will the projectors dare to assert, that at any of these meetings, or even at the meeting at *Wolsley-Bridge* in *December* last (*really and truly the only one which ushered in this application to parliament*) any idea was started of the company of proprietors *participating with the Duke of Bridgewater at Preston Brook*, or of the canal’s being declared to *terminate at Runcorn-Gap*?

Of the project *disclosed in this Bill*, the *notoriety* entirely fails; and our *arguments* remain *unanswered and untouched*; we wish, that our adversaries would pay the same justice to our *properties*.

Nothing is said as to “the plan being well digested,” only in the title page of “*The Facts and reasons*;”——no attempt has been made to prove, that any actual survey has been made in order to apprise the freeholders interested;——or calculations of goods likely to be carried, so as equitably to regulate the tonnage;——nay if their *accurate* engineer is to be believed, their capital of 150,000*l.* is unequal to the expence; *and their scheme must be ruined*; for though at one time he names 101,000*l.*; and at another “*one hundred and thirty-three thousand and ELEVEN HUNDRED pounds*;” yet the aggregate of his estimate given to the committee is 158,125*l.* which happens to be 8,125*l.* more than the capital authorized to be raised by the Bill.

This unhappy slip cannot be accounted for, only by supposing, that this wonderful projector has arrived

rived to such a pitch of *self-infallibility*, that he presumed, that no one would venture to cast up a sum after him ; and that the grossest impositions would be implicitly swallowed.

These industrious projectors having declared their confidence “ that they shall be able to refute, by “ evidence, the groundless objections and injurious “ insinuations which have been industriously propagated by nameless writers ; ” it may not be unreasonable to remind them, that nothing has been thrown out in the pamphlet, entitled “ Seasonable “ Considerations, &c.” which is not founded in a religious attention to truth ; and that all the facts will be proved, and every allusion fully explained, whenever there shall be occasion.

When our all is at stake, these gentlemen must not be surprized at bold truths. We conceive more favourably of their *understanding* than of their *virtue* ; we cannot suspect them of entertaining the chimerical idea of cutting through *Hare Castle*. We rather believe, that they are desirous of cutting their canal at both ends ; and of leaving the middle for the project of a future day. Are these projectors *jealous* of their *honour* ? Let them adopt a clause (which reason and justice strongly enforce) to restrain them from meddling with *either end*, till they have finished the *great trunk* ? This, and this alone will shield them from suspicion.

We have been bound by every tie of duty to lay our case publickly before parliament, in whose wisdom and justice we thus repeat our *dutiful confidence* ; and whose proceedings, we do not presume either “ to mistake or arraign.”

OBJECTIONS to *part* of the proposed canal from *Wilden Ferry* to the *Mersey*; humbly submitted by the *true* Friends of the Scheme “for opening a Communication between *Hull* and “*Liverpool*,” who wish,

to *confine* this Canal between *Burton* and *Northwich*; which will considerably *hasten* the *Communication*;—*relieve* the *Undertakers* of forty thousand Pounds Expence;—*protect* forty thousand Pounds Capital, employed in the *Burton*, and *Northwich* Navigations, from *Ruin*; *preserve* thirty Miles of *Land* from *Devastation*;—and completely *answer* all the *real* Purposes of *public Utility*.

GREAT pains have been used in printed pieces to inculcate a belief, “that the plan of the canal “has not wanted public notoriety;—” that “a survey was taken in 1755;” “another in 1758, and “a pamphlet published;”—“a public meeting in “1760, at *Sandon* in *Staffordshire*;”—“other meetings in *March*, *May* and *June*, 1765;—at the “last of which, the heads of a Bill were produced;”—will the projectors dare to assert, that at any of these meetings, or even at the meeting at *Wolsley Bridge* in *December* last (*really and truly the only one which ushered in this application to parliament*) any idea was started of the company of proprietors *participating* with the Duke of *Bridgewater* at *Preston-Brook*, or of the canal’s being declared to *terminate* at *Runcorn Gap*?

N. B. Many miles of land, lying out of the course of the canal, will be cut through without due notice, or any regular petition. A precedent deserving the most *jealous* attention of parliament!

Of

Of the project *disclosed in this Bill*, the *notoriety* entirely fails.

Nothing has been advanced, as to “the plan being well digested,” only in the title page of a paltry piece, entitled, “The Facts and Reasons;” no attempt has been made to prove, that any actual survey has been made in order to apprise the freeholders interested;—or calculation of goods likely to be carried, so as equitably to regulate the tonnage;—nay if their *accurate* engineer is to be believed, their capital of 150,000*l.* is unequal to the expence; *and their scheme must be ruined*; for though at one time he names 101,000*l.* and at another “one hundred and thirty-three thousand and ELEVEN HUNDRED pounds;” yet the aggregate of his estimate given to the committee is 158,125; which happens to be 8,125*l.* more than the capital authorized to be raised by the Bill.

“Public utility does not require, that the proposed canal should be extended beyond either Burton or Northwich; a communication between Hull and Liverpool (and not Manchester) being the object of this Bill.

“It is therefore humbly submitted to the legislature, Whether it would not be a very great injury to the Public,” as well as an unnecessary violation of private property, to suffer “a canal” to run nearly parallel for thirty miles, with two good navigations; and to endanger a capital of forty thousand pounds; “when it might so much more advantageously terminate” at Burton and Northwich; relieve the undertakers, already unmercifully loaded; preserve from depredation a fund from the *Weaver* navigation, which is sacred to public uses; secure thirty miles of land from grievous mutilation; and promote every consideration of *real public utility*.

The following candid calculations deserve attention.

	£.	s.	d.
By the river, the present average price of carriage from <i>Burton</i> to <i>Gainsborough</i> is per ton	0	10	0
From <i>Wilden</i> to <i>Gainsborough</i> , where the navigation is allowed to be free, the average price is	0	8	0
Therefore from <i>Burton</i> to <i>Wilden</i> , about 19 miles, the expence is per ton	0	2	0
By the canal from <i>Burton</i> to <i>Wilden</i> , being 16 miles, the tonnage may amount to	0	2	0
Freight, upon an average, cannot be less than 1 d. per mile	0	1	4
“Saving to the Public,” by stopping the canal at <i>Burton</i> , “per ton”	0	1	4

The *Burton* navigation is stigmatized as a monopoly; the present lessees have not been engaged more than three years; and are not answerable for the misconduct of their predecessors in 1749, or in any other period.

Let public indignation alight where it ought: they are anxious to meet every charge of insolence or exaction: armed with conscious integrity, they appeal with confidence to the just tribunal of a *British* parliament.

By

	£.	s.	d.
By the canal; tonnage from <i>Witton-Bridge</i> to <i>Runcorn</i> , being fifteen miles, 10 at 1½d. and 5 at 1d. is -	0	1	8
Freightage at one penny <i>per</i> mile for fifteen miles, is -	0	1	3
Wharfage and transshipping at <i>Runcorn</i> -	0	0	9
Freight from thence to <i>Liverpool</i> -	0	2	0
	0	5	8
By the river; the tonnage and freightage from <i>Northwich</i> to <i>Liverpool</i> do not upon an average exceed -	0	4	0
	0	1	8

So that here is a *true* saving by the river of one shilling and eight pence *per* ton.

The owners and trustees of the old navigations beg leave to submit, “ that the tonnage, collected
“ by the company of proprietors, ought to be equal,
“ through the whole canal, for every species of
“ goods; with some particular exceptions.”

If the proprietors should succeed in fixing *different* tolls on *different* species of goods, a dreadful extent of mischief must follow; because by imposing a very low tonnage for all the *staple articles* of the old navigations, they must necessarily be stripped of all their trade; and when these are irreparably destroyed, and every possibility of contest ceases, a *friendly* meeting of commissioners may raise and even perpetuate the tonnage, at the highest price which the act of parliament authorises.

The company of proprietors ought not to be formed into a company of navigators beyond a certain number. Intuition shews the necessity and

utility of this provision. Proprietors of tolls (by consolidating tonnage and freightage in one charge) might take an inferior tonnage upon goods navigated by themselves; and full tonnage upon all others; and would consequently monopolize the freightage of the whole canal; for *who* could carry goods upon equal terms with those who can make a considerable deduction in the lock dues?

It is suspected, that the projectors do not entertain the chimerical idea of cutting through *Hare Castle*. It is rather believed, that they are desirous of cutting their canal at both ends; and of leaving the middle for the project of a future day. Are these projectors *jealous* of their *honour*? Let them adopt a clause (which reason and justice strongly enforce) to restrain them from meddling with *either end*, till they have finished their *great trunk*? This, and this alone will shield them from suspicion.

The old navigators are bound by every tie of duty to lay their appeal publickly before parliament; in whose wisdom and justice they repeat their *dutiful confidence*.

A Calculation proving that the intended Navigation by a Canal from the Trent to the Mersey is in Danger of becoming a Monopoly.

THE tonnage, settled, is not to exceed $1\frac{1}{2}d.$ per ton per mile.

A high tonnage is ever the parent of a *monopoly*; which is proved, by experience, in other cases.

To demonstrate this;

The Tonnage of $1\frac{1}{2}d.$ per mile, is for £. s. d.
every ten miles 0 1 3

Let it be supposed, every person carrying goods upon the canal, may do it upon an average at $1d.$ per mile freightage, which for 10 miles is 0 0 10

Total tonnage and freightage for ten miles 0 2 1

Should the company of proprietors form themselves into a company of navigators, (supposing freightage the same as above) $1d.$ per ton per mile, for ten miles, is 0 0 10

Out of this high tonnage, it is very easy to foresee, that the proprietors may abate for what goods they carry, one halfpenny per mile; which for ten miles will reduce the tonnage to 0 0 10

Total tonnage and freight for ten miles, by proprietors 0 1 8

This halfpenny abated from the tonnage, is half the real value of the freight; and therefore it will be impossible for any other navigator to carry goods, in opposition to the company of proprietors, under an embargo of 50 per cent. But all competition being

ing destroyed, they may raise the price of carriage without limitation.

Will not this be a monopoly of the first rate?

To remedy this glaring evil, it is proposed, that the company of proprietors may, by a short clause, be restrained from acting as an united company of navigators.—Not to prohibit every individual of them from being a navigator, or any number as partners, not more than 3, 4, or 5; for the subdivided partnerships will rival each other, and the public, by that means, be secured.

If those who act for the company of proprietors of the intended canal, have no design of a *monopoly*, they will not object to such restraining clause.—If they do, the conclusion necessarily follows.

It ought to be a fundamental rule in all public navigation bills, to keep separate and independent, the offices of undertaker and navigator, as the conjunction of those offices is always found to be the principal, if not only, cause of a *monopoly*.

April 14th, 1766.

During this contest a bill was brought into parliament by the *Cheshire* gentlemen, in order to establish the *Macclesfield* canal: it passed the House of Commons, but was dismissed by the Lords. Another bill, for leave to cut a navigation from *Wilden-Ferry* to the Duke of *Bridgewater's* canal at *Preston-Brook*, and from thence, jointly, to be carried on to the *Mersey*, at or near *Runcorn-Gap*, passed both Houses of Parliament; as did a third bill, for cutting a navigable canal from the river *Severn*, between *Bewdley* and *Titton-Brook*, in *Worcestershire*, to cross the river *Trent* at or near *Heywood-Mill* in *Staffordshire*, and to communicate with a canal intended to be made between the said river *Trent* and the *Mersey*.

F I N I S.

BOOKS printed for T. LOWNDES.

1. **N**EW Editions of LOWNDES's Marriage Registers, on Paper, Parchment, and Vellum. Twenty-five Sheets of Demy Paper contain 400 complete Registers, which are sold at 4s. and those on Medium Paper, 6s. Some are printed on Parchment, Demy Size, at 8d. others on Vellum, Demy Size, at 1s. 6d. per Leaf.

2. Gibson's Codex, or Body of Ecclesiastical Law, 2 Vols. 3l. 3s. in Quires.

3. Milton's Paradise Lost, illustrated with Dr. Newton's Notes, and Cuts designed by Mr. Hayman, 2 Vols. Quarto, 2l. 10s.

4. The same Book, 2 Vols. Octavo, 12s.

5. Heister's General History of Surgery, 1l. 1s.

6. Curiously printed in Four Volumes, Octavo, adorned with large Maps, and a great Variety of Copper-Plates, engraved by G. Vandergucht: The General History of China, Chinese Tartary, Corea and Thibet, done from the celebrated Work of the Pere de Halde; in which are comprised all the authentic Accounts formerly published by Father Lewis le Comte, and others, concerning that Empire. By R. Brookes, A. M. late Rector of Ashney in Northamptonshire.

In this Work are included a great many Translations and curious Extracts of Chinese Books upon most of the Arts and Sciences, and an entire Chinese Tragedy, called The Little Orphan, on which Mons. Voltaire and Mr. Murphy have wrote two Plays; with the entertaining Travels and Adventures of several of the Jesuit Missionaries, and others in those Countries, 1l.

7. Salmon's Geographical Grammar, 6s.

8. Gordon's Geographical Grammar, 5s.

BOOKS printed for T. LOWNDES.

9. Uring's Voyages and Travels, with a Draught of the Bay of Honduras, 5s.

10. The Dramatic Works of Aaron Hill, Esq; to which are added the Life and Love Letters of the Author, 2 Vols. 10s.

11. A Tour through Spain and Portugal. By Uvedal Price, Esq; Second Edition, 5s.

12. Dr. Burnet's State of the Dead, and of those that are to rise. Translated from the Latin Original by the Rev. Mr. Earbery. The usual Price was 13s. but now the few remaining Copies are sold for 6s. only.

13. Dr. Burnet's Enquiry into the Doctrine of the Philosophers of all Nations, concerning the Original of the World. Translated by Mr. Mead and Mr. Foxton, 5s.

14. Dr. Burnet's Archeologiæ Philosophicæ: Or the ancient Doctrine concerning the Original of Things, the Immateriality of the Earth, &c. Translated by Mr. Foxton, 5s.

15. Cole's Latin and English Dictionary, 6s.

16. Boyer's French and English Dictionary, 6s.

17. Dr. James's Dispensatory, 3d Edition, 7s.

18. Shaw's Parish Law, 6s.

19. Will's Dionysius with Maps, 3s. 6d.

20. Female Banishment; or, the Woman Hater. Originally wrote by the Chevalier De Mouhy, Author of the Fortunate Country Maid, 2 Vols. 6s.

21. Theobald's Shakespear, 8 Volumes, with Cuts, 24s.

22. Fortunate Country Maid, by the Chevalier De Mouhy, 2 Vols. 5s.

23. The Prater, by Nicholas Babble, Esq; This Edition is enlarged and improved, a Table of Contents prefixed, and the Mottoes translated, and adapted to modern Manners, 3s.

24. The

BOOKS printed for T. LOWNDES.

24. The Antigallican ; or the History and Adventures of Harry Cobham, Esq; inscribed to Louis the XVth.

*No smuggled pilfer'd Scenes from France we shew ;
He's English, English, Sirs, from Top to Toe.* 3s.

25. Hudibras, with Hogarth's Cuts, 3s. 6d.

26. The Voyages, Travels and Adventures of William Owen Gwin Vaughan, Esq; with the History of his Brother Jonathan Vaughan, Six Years a Slave in Tunis. Intermixed with the Histories of Clerimont, Maria, Eleanora, and others. Full of various Turns of Fortune. In 2 Vols. 5s.

27. The Auction, a Modern Novel, 2 Vols. 6s.

28. Sir John Vanbrugh's Plays, 2 Vols. 6s.

29. Milton's Paradise Lost, with Cuts, 3s. 6d.

30. Dr. Smollet's Don Quixote, with elegant Plates, 4 Vols. 12s.

31. The Works of the ingenious Mr. Geo. Farquhar, containing all his Poems, Letters, Essays, and Comedies ; with some Memoirs of the Author, 2 Vols. 6s.

32. Sir Richard Steel's Dramatic Works, with his Life, 2s. 6d.

33. A Tour through the whole Island of Great Britain, 4 Vols. 12s.

34. An Apology for the Conduct of Mrs. Teresa Constantia Philips, 3 Vols. 9s.

35. The History of Miss Harriot Watson, 2 Vols. 4s. sewed.

36. Poems by Mrs. Tollet, viz. Anne Boleyn to King Henry VIII. &c. 2s.

37. Letters of Abelard and Heloise. To which is prefixed, A particular Account of their Lives, Amours and Misfortunes. By the late J. Hughes, Esq; To which Cuts are now first added, with the Poem of Eloïsa to Abelard, by Mr. Pope, 1s. 6d. sewed.

38. The

BOOKS printed for T. LOWNDES.

38. The same Book on fine Paper, with elegant Plates, 2s. 6d. bound.

39. Shakespear's Works, 9 Vols. 15s.

40. The Fair Circassian, a Dramatic Performance, with Cuts. To which are added, Several Occasional Poems. By Dr. Croxal, when a Gentleman-Commoner of Oxford, 1s.

41. Dr. Gerard's Divine Meditations, 3s.

42. Philips's Splendid Shilling, 1s. or all his Poems, with Cuts, 2s. 6d. bound.

43. Barrow's Naval History, illustrated with 22 Maps, Naval Engagements, Heads, &c. 4 Vols. 12s.

44. Johnson's Compleat Letter Writer, 2s.

45. Mrs. Centlivre's Plays, with her Life by a Lady, 3 Vols. 9s.

46. Cibber's Plays, 5 Vols. 15s.

47. Brown's Roman History, by Way of Question and Answer, for the Use of Schools, 2s.

48. Mr. Martin's Universal Gazetteer, with seven Maps, 3s. 6d.

49. The English Theatre: Containing Twenty Comedies, and Twenty Tragedies; being the most valuable Plays that have been acted upon the British Stage, and now selected from the following Authors: Sir R. Steele, Sir J. Vanburgh, Aaron Hill, Esq; J. Dryden, Esq; C. Cibber, Esq; J. Addison, Esq; Dr. Young, Dr. Hoadley, Mr. Farquhar, Mr. Otway, Mr. Congreve, Mr. Rowe, Mr. Lillo, Mrs. Centlivre, &c. in 8 Vols. 12mo. 1l. 4s.

50. The Life and Adventures of Frank Clive.

"The Lucky have whole Days, which still they chuse,

"Th' Unlucky have but Hours, and those they lose."

In 2 Vols. Twelves, 5s. sewed.

51. Pomfret's Poems on several Occasions, 1s. 6d.

52. The Surprises of Love, in 4 Novels.

Brindley, James

The History Of Inland Navigations, Particularly those of the Duke of
Bridgwater, In Lancashire and Cheshire, And the intended one promoted by
Earl Gower and other Persons of Distinction in Staffordshire, Cheshire,
and Derbyshire the whole shewing the Utility and Importance of Inland
Bd.: 2

London 1766

Brit. 290-1/2

urn:nbn:de:bvb:12-bsb10280167-2